

26 February 1991

*Cricket, Class and Colonialism, c.1860-1914: A Study of 2 Elites. The
Marylebone and Melbourne Cricket Clubs.*

I declare that this thesis has been composed entirely by me and that the work within the thesis is also my own.

James Bradley.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Cricket, Class and Colonialism examines the relationship between two élite cricket clubs (the Marylebone and Melbourne CCs), the process of class formation and the control of cricket. To this end it examines the personnel on the executive committees of the two institutions as well as the interaction between the clubs and other institutions involved in the running of the game. The thesis is divided into three sections. The first is an introduction to the historiography of class and sports as well as an examination of the nature of the ideology of cricket. The second deals with the Marylebone CC and comprises of an examination of the committee of the club and the importance that this had to the development and control of the game in Britain and its empire. The third and final section is a corresponding study of the Melbourne CC.

The thesis establishes that in both cases the control of the club was placed in the hands of members of the dominant class. Equally the thesis is one of the first examinations of the role of clubs within cricket. Clubs are central social institutions in the framework of sport and they function both as a producer of sport and also as a forum for conviviality.

The thesis demonstrates that cricket was used by members of the dominant class to secure or challenge cohesion within its own ranks. It was therefore part of the creation and maintenance of the class structure. Thus the Marylebone CC became one of the foci for the London Season, making membership a socially prestigious badge and strengthening its claims to control cricket. The Melbourne CC used cricket to establish its predominance as a social institution within Victoria and Australia. Both clubs 'invented' their own traditions. They built up mythologies designed to reinforce their position within the organisational structure of cricket. These traditions operated within the confines of the ideology of cricket but also developed from the social composition of the membership. Neither club was overly interested in the ideology of cricket functioning as a weapon of hegemony over a subordinate class. They were more interested in gaining paramount position within their own class. With the Marylebone the traditions were founded on a degree of reality. They were able to use these traditions combined with their own social background to take over the running of cricket. With the Melbourne CC, matters were more complex. The social structure of Australia was more fluid and the dominant class more fragmented. They faced challenges from other organisations from similar class backgrounds who felt that they had an equal right to control cricket. In the end it is possible to see that the traditions that the Marylebone CC deployed were more successful and more complete. The Melbourne CC on the other hand continually faced contestation. Their traditions were only accepted by a few groups within the dominant class. They were therefore unable to act as a focus in the same way, although they attempted to do so.

This thesis shows that cricket could have different meanings for different people. The Australian meaning is specifically different to the English meaning. Sections of the subordinate class might find completely different meanings or no meanings at all. This is perhaps the result of the cultural nature of cricket. The game could be re-invented by groups to serve their own cultural purposes. As it is the meanings that the Melbourne CC imposed on cricket were distinctly similar to the Marylebone interpretation. Nevertheless the game could take on specific usages in the Melburnian context that would have been unthought of in England.

**CRICKET, CLASS AND COLONIALISM, c.1860-1914: A
STUDY OF 2 ELITES.THE MARYLEBONE AND
MELBOURNE CRICKET CLUBS.**

James Bradley



**Ph.D
University of Edinburgh
1991**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	p.iii
Abbreviations	p.v
Acknowledgements	p.vi
Preface	p.1
Part 1: Cricket: Meanings and Interpretations	p.3
Chapter 1: Interpreting Sport History	p.4
Chapter 2: The Evolution of an Ethic	p.36
Part 2: The Marylebone Cricket Club: Class, Society and Empire, 1860-1914	p.68
Chapter 3: The Committee of the Marylebone Cricket Club and Victorian Society	p.69
Chapter 4: The Parliament House of Cricket: The Marylebone Cricket Club and the Control of Domestic and Imperial Cricket	p.107
Part 3: The Melbourne Cricket Club and the Struggle for the Control of Australian Cricket, 1860-1914	p.145
Chapter 5: The Melbourne Cricket Club, Class and Victorian Society, 1860-1914	p.146
Chapter 6: The Committee, Cricket and Ideology	p.190
Chapter 7: For Club, Colony or Country: The Melbourne Cricket Club and the Battle for the Control of Australian Cricket	p.224
Conclusion	p.274
Bibliography	p.281

LIST OF TABLES

The Marylebone Cricket Club Committee

3.1: Membership of the Marylebone Cricket Club	p.77
3.2: Average Age	p.90
3.3: Education	
3.3a: Attendance at Schools	p.92
3.3b: Higher Education	p.93
3.4: Primary Derivation of Wealth	p.95
3.5: Urban Professionals and Businessmen	
3.5a: Professions	p.96
3.5b: Businessmen	p.97
3.5c: Summary of data	p.97
3.6: Directorships	p.98
3.7: Members of the Landed Elite	
3.7a: Landowners by Bateman's Classification	pp.100-01
3.7b: Summary of Data	p.102
3.8: Titles	p.102

The Melbourne Cricket Club Committee

5.1: Birthplace	
5.1a: British Isles	p.166
5.1b: Australia	p.166
5.1c: Summary of Data	p.167
5.2: Education	p.169
5.3: Professions and Occupations	
5.3a: Occupations	p.178
5.3b: Urban Professionals	p.179
5.3c: Commerce, Business, Banking and Accounting	p.179
5.4: Committee Members Belonging to the Melbourne Club	p.183

Professional Cricketers at the Melbourne Cricket Club

6.1: Professional Cricketers at the Melbourne Cricket Club, 1860-1900

6.1a: 1860-1883

p.206

6.1b: 1883-1900

p.207

A.S.P.

Australian Journal of Sport Studies

B.C.C.

Bicycle Club in Victorian and New South Wales

C.C.

Cricket Club

C.C.C.

Country Cricket Club

D.N.B.

Dictionary of National Biography

E.M.C.C.

East Melbourne Cricket Club

I.J.H.S.

International Journal of the History of Sport

M.C.C.

Melbourne Melbourne Cricket Ground

M.M.C.C.

North Melbourne Cricket Club

N.S.W.

New South Wales

N.S.W.C.A.

New South Wales Cricket Association

S.A.C.A.

South Australian Cricket Association

S.C.C.

Sydney Cricket Ground

S.M.C.C.

South Melbourne Cricket Club

V.C.A.

Victorian Cricket Association

V.C.L.

Victorian Cricketers' League

Vic.

Victoria

Measurements

£1 = 20 Shillings

12d. = 1 Shilling

12 1/2 = 1 Guinea

All cricket measurements are in Imperial Standard measurement as they remain this way as of 1970.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Australian Board of Control
ACC	Australian/Australasian Cricket Council
A.D.B.	<i>Australian Dictionary of Biography</i>
ANA	Australian Natives Association
B.J.S.H.	<i>British Journal of Sport History</i>
B.L.V.	<i>Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle</i>
CC	Cricket Club
CCC	County Cricket Club
D.N.B	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
EMCC	East Melbourne Cricket Club
I.J.H.S.	<i>International Journal of the History of Sport</i>
MCG	Melbourne/Metropolitan Cricket Ground
NMCC	North Melbourne Cricket Club
NSW	New South Wales
NSWCA	New South Wales Cricket Association
SACA	South Australian Cricket Association
SCG	Sydney Cricket Ground
SMCC	South Melbourne Cricket Club
VCA	Victorian Cricket Association
VCL	Victorian Cricketers' League
Vic.	Victoria

Measurements

£1 = 20 Shillings

12d. = 1 Shilling

£1 1s = 1 Guinea

All cricket measurements are in Imperial Standard measurement as they remain this way to the present day.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the product of the period between the Autumn of 1987 and the Autumn of 1990. During that time I have scoured countless different sources, inhabited many libraries and travelled half-way round the world in an attempt to provide a new perspective on sport, history and society. If I have succeeded it is due, in part, to the efforts of hundreds of different people.

Financially I have been assisted by the British Academy and the Northcote Scholarship Scheme, both of which have acted generously and promptly. Without the help and support of the History Department at the University of Edinburgh this thesis would never have been produced in this particular form. The access I have been allowed to the Department's computers has been generous. I was also helped considerably by Ormond College in Melbourne, which provided a steady home on what could have been a very lonely research trip. Stephen Green at the Marylebone CC library was very considerate when I visited and the Club allowed me access to all the documents I wanted to see. At the Melbourne CC I was made welcome and was given superb back-up by Rex Harcourt and Ross Peacock, both of whom went out of their way to supply me with information. All the staff of the National Library of Scotland have assisted as well, at one time or another. Thanks must also go to Sallyanne Hunter who did a lot of the photocopying.

Many different scholars have made suggestions/criticisms of my work and I would particularly like to thank Dr. Richard Cashman, School of History at the University of New South Wales, and Dr. Stuart Macintyre, Department of History in the University of Melbourne. I also owe a debt to Margaret Ashworth who made me think properly about what I was doing, perhaps for the first time. On top of this Hamish Maxwell-Stewart kindly read the seminal draft of the thesis on a cold and windy weekend in Sutherland. Tom Barron gave me strong support as my secondary supervisor. Above all, though, I must thank Ian Duffield, my main supervisor, who has wisely kept my nose to the grind-stone, given me many ideas, read my provisional drafts, brought me beer and done much more besides.

It is often said that doing a Ph.D is a lonely task. However, for the past three years I have had Susan with me. She has always kept faith in my work and she has been unbelievably supportive and patient. It is to her that I owe my biggest debt.

PREFACE

EXPLORING CRICKET HISTORY

Cricket is part of the fabric of British and Australian society. As a game it has a long history, but it is hard to say when it emerged as distinct from the many folk sports that were played in early modern England. Nevertheless, it was certainly in the seventeenth century that cricket can be said to have come out from its folk origins and started upon its long 'adaptive' phase. From the middle of that century it appears that the game became popular among the aristocracy, having been originally a rural pastime played by agricultural workers. From then it spread slowly from its Southern home to other areas of England. The eighteenth century saw cricket make many strides forward. First Slindon and then Hambledon dominated the game under aristocratic patronage. Great matches were played in London with large crowds watching and considerable stakes wagered on the teams. By the end of the century it was an established sport that would have been recognisable as the game played today. However, like most modern sports, it was in the nineteenth century that it made its greatest advances. Initially it was stimulated by the great professional teams that criss-crossed the country playing against towns and villages and then, when the professionals had been driven from the marketplace, it was developed gradually under the auspices of the counties and the Marylebone CC, who created a fully fledged championship competition by 1894. By the end of the century cricket had become part of a large sports industry in Britain. Meanwhile, the game had acquired an international pedigree. It had been played in the West Indies since the late eighteenth century. The first recorded game of cricket in Australia occurred in 1803. Wherever the English went they seemed to take cricket with them and by 1859 touring teams from England were taking their skills to foreign countries to spread the creed and for financial gain. By 1877 Australia was able to beat the strongest sides sent to the colonies by the English and in 1882 they defeated the cream of England at 'Home' thus instigating the legend of the 'ashes'. Thus, by 1914, cricket was one of the more important sporting institutions in Britain and its Empire.

In recent years, historians have become interested in the role of sport in society. Those who have examined Britain or Australia have been drawn to cricket, not specifically because of its history, but more due to what it was believed to represent ideologically in the Victorian world. Contemporary commentators on the game tended to emphasise its ideological qualities, for from the eighteenth century it was regarded as being a specifically English game, which had the potential to instil manliness into the competitors. Thus 'fair play', manliness and other qualities that were believed to be specifically Anglo-Saxon were believed to be instilled by the playing of the game. Equally, it was said that the game, which early on had developed a cadre of professional players, helped to bring about conciliation between classes. It was thus the

game of 'peasant and peer'. It also developed elements that seemed to be an indirect critique of the developing industrial society by emphasising the pastoral aspects of cricket. The village game became the absolute apotheosis of this, many believing that village cricket was the most real form of the game. It was also said that cricket, because of its ethic and its Englishness had the potential to unite England with her imperial offspring. All this is grist to the mill of historians and sociologists.

This thesis too is an examination of the game and its ethic, but more specifically, it is a detailed analysis of the way that cricket was used by two different élites and the effect that this had upon the evolution of cricket as a sport. It has to be noted that the two clubs in question were a long way removed from the idyll of village and/or recreational cricket, tending to operate their influence within the higher echelons of the game. Consequently this thesis is a long way removed from what might be regarded as the roots of the game. Nevertheless, as this is an exploration of cricket, class and colonialism the two groups in question are relevant, not least because of the high position that they held in the cricket world. The form that this thesis will take is simple. Of the seven chapters the first two will examine the development of cricket's distinct ideology and interpretations that historians have made of this by way of introduction. Chapters 3 and 4 will look at the Marylebone CC, their place in Society and their effect on Cricket, while the remaining three chapters comprise of a detailed study of the Melbourne CC in the context of Australian society and the organisation of Australian cricket. It might appear that this is a slightly unbalanced approach, with the weight placed on the side of Melbourne. This is intentional, for the simple reason that less has been written about the Melbourne CC and their history in the turbulent organisation of Australian cricket, and therefore more explanation is required. Another question that might be asked is the validity of a comparison between an English institution and an Australian one. On this there are no problems. As will be seen, for the duration of the period 1860-1914, there was a special cricketing relationship between the two which has persisted to this day. In all, this thesis will explain how cricket became part of the history of social structures in transformation.

CHAPTER 1. INTERPRETING SPORT HISTORY

I

Sport History in Britain and Australia

In recent years there has been an explosion in the study of sport. It is no longer proper to say that sport has been neglected or ignored. Times have changed since the first edition of the *British Journal of Sport History* in the spring of 1984, where James Walvin addressed the problem of the paucity of the British historiography in the inaugural article.¹ Likewise, in Australia, sport has become, to varying extents, a *bona fide* field of enquiry since sports historians 'came out' in 1979,² while in North America the discipline has had an even longer history.³ In the last few years there have been major books published on the history sport. In Britain these include: Mason's book on the history of Association Football; Holt's excellent *Sport and the British*; Vamplew's detailed account of the development of professionalism and the sports industry in Britain; Mangan's work on athleticism and the games ethic in the public schools and Empire; and McCrone's account of women and sport in the nineteenth century.⁴ There have also been a clutch of books edited by Mangan, containing many essays of value,⁵ while the *British Journal of Sport History* has broadened its horizons

1 J.Walvin, 'Sport, Social History and the Historian', *British Journal of Sport History* (B.J.S.H.), Vol.1, No.1, (1984). As he said, 'What is hard to reconcile is the manifest discrepancy between the undeniable significance of sport in the contemporary world and the refusal of many to accept the importance of sport in its historical setting'. (p.13).

2 R.Cashman, 'The Making of Australian Sporting Traditions', *International Journal of the History of Sport* (I.J.H.S.), Vol.4, No.1, (1987), p.84. In this article Cashman describes the euphoria at the first *Making of Sporting Traditions* conference. 'Speaker after speaker testified to having harboured a desire to write about sport, but it was not until now that they were willing to come out of the closet...there were very few doubts about the future viability of sports history writing'.

3 The North American Society of Sport Historians had been founded in the early 1970s, while the *Journal of Sport History* was first issued in 1973. Among the pioneers of American sport history is A.Guttmann, whose book *From Ritual to Record. The Nature of Modern Sports*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1978) is one of the classic accounts of sport theory and practice. In Canada there was encouragement of the discipline, at an earlier date. In 1975, the Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies said 'There are encouraging signs...that sport is becoming more widely viewed as an important part of our culture and as a legitimate facet of Canadian Studies'. G.Redmond, 'Sport History in Academe: Reflections on a Half-Century of peculiar Progress', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, No.1, (1984), p.30. The publication R.Gruneau, *Class, Sports, and Social Development*, (University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst 1983), seems to prove this.

4 ^{Tony} Mason, *Association Football and English Society*, (Harvester, Brighton 1980); R.Holt, *Sport and the British*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1990); W.Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game. Professional Sport in Britain, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988); J.A.Mangan, *Athleticism In The Victorian and Edwardian Public School*, (Oxford University Press, London 1981) and *The Games Ethic and Imperialism*, (Viking, London 1986); K.E.McCrone, *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914*, (Routledge, 1988).

5 J.A.Mangan, (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism. British Culture and Sport at Home and Abroad 1700-1914*, (Frank Cass, London 1988); J.A.Mangan, (ed.), *Sport and National Identity. The*

to become the *International Journal of the History of Sport*. When this is added to the work that has been done in the history and sociology of leisure one can see that there exists now a fairly extensive historiography. In Australia the story is similar, stemming initially from the seminal work of Mandle who wrote a series of articles on cricket in the early 1970s.¹ Since then the Australian Society for Sport History has been formed, and under the guiding hand of the likes of Cashman, Stoddart and Sissons great steps forward have been made. In the last few years there have been significant publications by Stoddart and Lawrence and Rowe.²

But more important than this is the impact that this area has had on the writing of more general histories. To be sure, Best noted early on the growth of sport and leisure in mid-Victorian Britain.³ Nevertheless, other historians have included at least a few pages on the impact of sport on society in the nineteenth century. F.M.L.Thompson, for example, includes an account of sport in *The Rise of Respectable Society*,⁴ while E.J.Hobsbawm, in *The Age of Empire*, believes that sport was one of the most significant cultural developments in late-nineteenth century European mass culture.⁵ The same trend has been evident in Australia, with many of the new general works of history paying at least some attention to sport. In the third volume of the *Oxford*

Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of the BSSH, (BSSH, North Staffs.1985); J.A.Mangan and R.J.Park, (eds.), *From Fair Sex to Feminism*, (Frank Cass, London 1987); J.A.Mangan and R.B.Small, (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (E.F.Spon, London 1986); J.A.Mangan and J.Walvin, (eds.), *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1987).

1 W.F.Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, Vol.59, No.4 (1973); 'Pommy Bastards and Damn Yankees', in W.F.Mandle, *Going It Alone. Australia's National Identity in the Twentieth Century*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic.1978); 'The Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Historical Studies*, Vol.15 (1973); 'The Professional Cricketer in England in the Nineteenth Century', *Labour History*, No.23 (1972).

2 R.Cashman, 'Ave A Go Yer Mug. Australian Cricket Crowds from Larrikin to Ocker', (Collins, Sydney 1987), *Australian Cricket Crowds. Daily Figures 1877-1984*, (History Project Incorporated, University Of New South Wales, N.S.W. 1984); R.Cashman and M.Mckernan, (eds.); *Sport in History. The Making of Modern Sporting Traditions*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia 1979), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media*, (New South Wales University Press, Kensington 1981); G.Lawrence and D.Rowe, *Power Play: The Commercialisation of Australian Sport*, (Hale and Iremonger, Sydney 1987); B.Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever: Sport in the Australian Culture*, (Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, N.S.W. 1987).

3 G.Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-75*, (Fontana, London 1989, 1st edn. 1971), pp.228-31.

4 F.M.L.Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society. A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830-1900*, (Fontana, London 1988), pp.295-300.

5 E.J.Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1987), pp.180-3. Also see E.J.Hobsbawm, 'Mass Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914', in E.J.Hobsbawm and T.O.Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988), pp.288-300.

History of Australia, Kingston acknowledges an unflattering but important role for sport in Australian social development.¹ Works by Macintyre, McLachlan, Alomes, Rickard and Connell and Irving all mention Sport, and even Manning Clark manages to slip references into the later volumes of his mega-tome on Australian history.²

Sport, then, has been recognised by many historians as having some role in the lives/culture of people, and they are now paying, at the least, lip-service to this relatively new area of social History. But how have historians of the social history of sport gone about interpreting this role and, more particularly, what relevance does this have for the study of the ideology of cricket and its effect on cricket, class and colonialism? The following chapter will examine these approaches and will then sketch out the framework with which this thesis will operate.

II

Themes and perspectives: interpreting sport history

Themes and interpretations of the history of sport are extremely varied, although the two areas are linked. There are several different methodological approaches that can be taken depending on the ideological stance of the scholar in question. Obviously this influences the particular themes examined. There are many different methodologies that have been applied in this field including: developmental and figurational sociology; Weberian analysis; Neo-Marxist theories of repression; and Gramscian hegemony. The themes that they have explored are also varied, but generally they address class, nationality and gender in the broad context of social development.

1 B.Kingston, *Oxford History Of Australia.Glad Confident Morning, 1860-1900*, Vol.3, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1988), p.198. She criticised Australian historians for an optimistic interpretation of sport, whereas, for her, sport fostered conformity, discouraged intellectual effort, encouraged militarism, strengthened imperial ties at the expense of Australian self-confidence (and thus dealt a mortal blow to Republicanism!), and diverted entrepreneurial energy. This slightly confusing list of charges, which can all be disproved as well as proved (there is evidence for both sides of the story), diminishes her most powerful point that sport mirrored work, in becoming sexually segregated.

2 S.Macintyre,*The Oxford History of Australia. The Succeeding Age, 1901-1942*, Vol.4, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1986), pp.65, 129; N.McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution*, pp. 155-6; S.Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, (Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, N.S.W. 1988), pp.16-17; J.Rickard, *Australia. A Cultural History*, (Longman, London 1988), pp.98-101; R.W.Connell and T.H.Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History. Documents, Narrative and Argument*, (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1980), p.127; C.M.H.Clark, Vols.1-3 of *History of Australia*, contain little reference to sports and pastimes, whereas the next 3 volumes have considerably more references. This a very good indicator of the changes that have occurred in Australian History as an academic discipline. See especially, Clark, C.M.H., *History of Australia Vol.4, 1851-1888*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1979), pp.290, 381-382, *History of Australia Vol.5, 1888-1915*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1981),pp.314-315. The reference cited in *Vol.5* is Manning Clark at his very worst. The words used to describe an ostensibly working-class sporting crowd fall just short of 'swinish multitude', and his disgust with the behaviour of the Proletariat is only thinly disguised.

Class and society ¹

Between the late eighteenth century and the mid-nineteenth Britain was transformed into an industrial society. This process was long and arduous, but what effectively occurred was that with industrialisation there was substantial urbanisation. Consequently, by the end of the mid-Victorian era, over half the population of Britain lived in towns or cities. This had a drastic effect upon patterns of work and leisure, with new work disciplines being instilled into the work-force and new patterns of leisure gradually replacing older forms.² From about 1850 these new patterns of leisure included the generation of what might be termed a sports industry.³ Old sports were transformed by codification. Improved communications, higher real wages and changes in patterns of work all contributed to sport becoming a mass spectacle, and part of a popular culture, by the beginning of the twentieth century. Sport became one of the recognisable phenomena of the Victorian era. But not only that, it spread from the bosom of Britain across the world. Association Football became pan-European, while cricket became an important sport in the Australian and other colonies.

The part that class played in the creation and sustenance of these sports appears obvious. Those who codified the sports were from upper or middle class backgrounds. They were the products of the new public school system that had adopted football and cricket for the purpose of controlling their pupils, instilling suitable bourgeois values, and creating a sense of cohesion.⁴ Once they codified these sports they spread downwards to the masses. Some, like cricket, retained their Georgian, pre-industrial spirit, while others, like Association Football, were soon fully professionalised drawing-on the mass support of the working-class to generate players and spectators. Sports could be identified with certain sections of society. Cricket was played on both a professional and amateur basis. It was regarded as a sport of class-conciliation. Rugby split along class lines, with one fragment going with the amateur bourgeoisie, while another devolved to the working-class North and professionalism. Football became a sport of the masses, played by the masses, but controlled by local élites. Not only this; the games generated their own ethics based on certain values most associated with the

¹ Note, for many of the different methodological approaches there are fine critiques in J.M.Hoberman, *Sport and Political Ideology*, (Heinemann, London 1984).

² E.P.Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', reprinted in A.Giddens and D.Held, *Classes, Power, and Conflict. Classical and Contemporary Debates*, (Macmillan, Basingstoke 1988), p.305.

³ W.Vamplew, 'Sport and industrialization: an economic interpretation of the changes in popular sport in nineteenth century England' in Mangan, *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, pp.7-17

⁴ See Mangan, *Athleticism*, esp. chs. 4,5,7.

bourgeoisie. These reached their clearest distillation in Cricket, which emphasised 'fair play' and cohesion.

All this is, of course, highly generalised and is open to several different interpretations. This apparently seamless account of the rise of sports can be highly contested. It does not explain adequately how bourgeois reorganisation created mass spectacle. It does not account for why this particular group decided to make these codifications. It does not reveal the complex social processes that were at work. For example, it does not debate whether Football became a mass or a popular culture. It does not indicate the complex mechanisms of amateur and professional. It fails to demonstrate the reasons for certain sports being adopted, adapted or thrust upon certain classes. It ignores the potential functions of ideology. All it does is say that these things happened. These set of historical occurrences are visible to all, but what they mean and how they worked is a subject of heated discourse.

'Civilizing process' and the 'quest for excitement'

The 'civilising process' and the 'quest for excitement' are two important concepts in the methodology of Figural/Developmental sociology's interpretation of the history of sport. Using this approach, Elias combined with Dunning were pioneers in the sociology and history of sport. There are two central concepts to Figural sociology. The first is the configuration, which refers to the belief that agents create figurations of social interaction that have the potential to develop in unforeseen ways. Like Functionalism, from which it partially springs, it retains the theory of interdependence, 'chains of function', although it rejects the implicit functionalist belief in society as a stable organic structure. It also rejects the idea that collection and processing of data are the central keys to observation and explanation. In essence, on its own terms, it attempts to strike the difficult balance between structure and agency. Within this framework, it uses the idea of the 'civilizing process', a central theme in the thought of Elias. Elias believed that

the social standard of conduct and sentiment, particularly in some upper-class circles, began to change fairly drastically from the sixteenth century onwards in a particular direction. The ruling of conduct and sentiment became stricter, more differentiated and all-embracing, but also more temperate, banishing excesses of self-castigation as well as self-indulgence...Further research made it probable that state-formation processes and particularly the subjection of the warrior classes to stricter control, the "courtization"

of nobles in continental countries, had something to do with the change in the code of sentiment and conduct.¹

This has led such scholars as Dunning and Sheard, and Brookes, to study the development of sport in relation to the rise of the urban-industrial complex, and more specifically the role of certain élite groups in the codification and organisation of sports.² Dunning has concentrated mainly on Football, and it is his theory that the history of football can be divided into four developmental stages. These chart the rise of the game from a folk form to an organised sport, a process which involves the withdrawal of support of folk football by local élites, the survival of the game in the Public Schools and the use made of reformed versions of the game in these schools as part of the civilizing process.³ In cricket Brookes has applied the same criteria, examining four different stages. He sees cricket as being transformed from its folk origins having been adopted and adapted by the aristocracy. Gradually the emergent middle class becomes the key class in the formation of first-class cricket, superseding, or at least assimilating with the aristocracy.⁴ The key factors in both explanations is the role of a class, or élite, within the context of industrial society. The development of both sports therefore give an insight into the way that society is developing, and they indicate a march forward for the 'civilizing process'.

This leads us to the concept of the 'quest for excitement'. Elias and Dunning attempted to develop a preliminary classification of spare-time activities, in part to demonstrate what function sport and leisure has in the modern world. The fifth classification relates too 'mimetic or play activities'. This group includes sport, theatre, racing, parties and many other pastimes. These serve a specific need for society as they provide 'the need to experience the upsurge of strong emotions in public - for a type of excitement which does not disturb and endanger the relative orderliness of social life as

1 N.Elias and E.Dunning, *Quest for Excitement. Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1986), p.21.

2 See, for example, E.Dunning and K.Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*, (Martin Robertson, Oxford 1979); C.Brookes, *English Cricket. The Game and its Players through the Ages*, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1978). Brookes' book, because it was produced for general public consumption is nowhere near as theoretical as his thesis on the same subject, which devotes much of the introduction to explaining the importance of the Developmental methodology, as well as highlighting the approach of Elias. It is especially significant that he studied under Dunning at the University of Leicester. See C.C.P.Brookes, *Cricket as a Vocation: A Study of the Development and Contemporary Structure of the Occupation and Career Patterns of the Cricketer*, Unpublished Ph.D, University of Leicester, (1974).

3 E.Dunning, 'The Development of Modern Football', in E.Dunning (ed.), *The Sociology of Sport. A Selection of Readings*, (Frank Cass, London 1971), pp.133-49.

4 Brookes, *English Cricket*, *im passim*.

the serious type of excitement is liable to do'.¹ Consequently, the 'quest for excitement' brings the 'civilizing process' up to date.

The work of Elias, Dunning, *et al.*, has been, and still is, extremely important to the development of the study of sport. Nevertheless their accounts of the rise of different sports are flawed. They do see a crucial role for class in the re-formation of folk sports; however, underlying this appears to be a peculiar kind of evolutionism. While there is a sense of the importance of sport to class, class emulation and status, there is an underlying belief that society is launched on an inevitable trajectory towards a state of current perfectability. There is little sense of the divisive potential of sport. There appears to be an overwhelming belief in their own objectivity or neutrality. This has led to criticism from various quarters.² Nevertheless, it would be wrong to throw out the baby with the bath water, because the Elias/Dunning view does draw attention to the importance of class to sports development.

From ritual to record - a Weberian approach

There have been few out-and-out Weberian explanations of the rise of modern sports, but one notable exception is the work of Allen Guttman. In 1978 he published *From Ritual to Record*. It was both a critique of Marxist and neo-Marxist theories, and a Weberian explanation for the rise of modern sports. In so doing he aims to show that the development of sport was a result ^{of} modernization, a change from the religious/romantic outlook of 'traditional' society, to the rationalised scientific world-view of modern society.

Guttman looks at 'traditional' sports, and then says that there are seven characteristics of modern sports which distinguish them from the older pastimes: secularism; equality of opportunity to compete and in the conditions of competition; specialization of roles; rationalization; bureaucratic organisation; quantification; and the quest for records.³ These develop as a result of changes that occur in society. Thus sport ('the microcosm') displays all the same characteristics of society ('the macrocosm'). The seven characteristics 'derive from the fundamental Weberian notion of the difference between the ascribed status of traditional society and the achieved

1 N.Elias and E.Dunning, 'The Quest for Excitement in Leisure', in Elias, Dunning, *Quest for Excitement*, pp.68-71.

2 For a detailed critique of the work of the Figurationists, see J.Horne and D.Jary, 'The Figurational Sociology of Sport and Leisure of Elias and Dunning: An Exposition and a Critique', in J.Horne, D.Jary and A.Tomlinson (eds.), *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1987), pp.86-103; also see for more specific criticisms of Dunning and Sheard, D.A.Reid, 'Folk-football, the Aristocracy and Cultural Change: A Critique of Dunning and Sheard', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.5, No.2, (1988).

3 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, pp.15-55. See especially the typology on p.54.

status of a modern one'.¹ The change to modern sports is therefore not a result of the rise of Protestantism or the triumph of capitalism and industrialisation *per se*, but actually is the product of a change of *weltanschauung* which was 'empirical, experimental, mathematical'.²

There is little comment on the importance of class to this particular process which seems odd, since Weber was not only interested in rationalization and Protestantism, but also class. Neither does Guttman see the 'pessimistic' side of the Weberian approach; the belief that intense bureaucratization and rationalization seemed to be making capitalist/industrial society into a cage. To be sure, he does mention differences in rates of participation in sport that seem to be caused by differences in class background, but he says that age, sex, education, religion and mobility are equally important.³ However, he hardly seems to see a place for class in the actual development of sports. Where he does he sees it as a remnant of 'the strict inequality of feudal sports'⁴ which obviously must disappear before sports become truly modern. His emphasis on equality of participation sounds hollow when one considers that those higher in the social spectrum have more resources, both financial and psychological, to enable easier participation in sports.⁵

From Ritual to Record is a very fine book. It is provocative, brave and ideological. But Guttman's determination to prove the Marxists and the neo-Marxists wrong leads him into several traps, the most notable of which is his insistence on the absolute economic determinism of Marxism.⁶ Not only that, the evidence which he deploys for the seven characteristics could easily be used by neo-Marxists to prove their case, or even by pessimistic Weberians to describe the bars on the 'iron cage' of capitalism.⁷

1 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, pp.80-1.

2 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, p.85.

3 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, p.82.

4 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, p.30.

5 Take, for example, skiing, the equipment for which is very expensive. Equally, the purchase of ski-passes etc. make it an inaccessible sport for those who do not have the financial resources.

6 Guttman, *From Ritual to Record*, p.70. Indeed, his Marxist interpretation of sport history is very much his interpretation of what he might say if he was a Marxist. There are very few examples in this particular passage from Marxist sport historians. Neither is there any place in his work for the cultural Marxism of E.P.Thompson. This particular part of his critique is undoubtedly the weakest in the whole book. His criticisms of the neo-Marxists are much nearer the mark, however.

7 In the conclusion of M.Weber, (trans. T.Parsons), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, (Unwin University Books, London 1967), pp.181-2, Weber describes the effect of the puritan asceticism on the workings of capitalism: 'For when asceticism was carried out of monastic cells into everyday life, and began to dominate worldly morality, it did its part in building the tremendous cosmos of the modern economic order. This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production which to-day determine the lives of all the individuals who are born

'Physical exercises, the very word [sic. trans] contains so much repression it makes you shudder'.¹ Neo-Marxist interpretations of sport

The neo-Marxist approach to sport both fascinates and repels Guttman, to the extent that he was prepared to translate B.Rigauer's *Sport and Work*.² Perhaps this seeming attraction of opposites illustrates that both Guttman and Rigauer have identified the same patterns but merely interpreted them differently. For example, Rigauer initially draws attention to the similarity between work and sport, believing that they are structurally analogous. His evidence for this is startlingly similar to that applied by Guttman to demonstrate the rise of the scientific world-view:

Although sports have constituted a specific realm of social behaviour, they remain embedded in interdependent social processes which account for their fundamental characteristics - discipline, authority, competition, achievement, goal-oriented rationality, organization and bureaucratization, to name but a few.³

Nevertheless, these perceived similarities wilt under the application of separate ideologies, and Rigauer and his contemporaries developed a full-scale polemic against sport and society.

Rigauer, Brohm, Gorz, Marcuse, *et.al.*, totally rejected sports and sporting practice. Gorz, for example, believed that if the worker was alienated at work then he is alienated outside of work. Any withdrawal into 'compensatory activities' merely heightens the alienation because it functions as a sop to prevent the full development of working-class consciousness. Thus there could be no 'proletarian culture until the barrier dividing the world of work from the world of leisure has been broken down'.⁴ Marcuse was even more extreme exclaiming that capitalism in its highest stage (which is what Marcuse naturally assumed was the contemporary situation) 'converts the *entire* individual - body and mind - into an instrument, or even part of an instrument: active or

into this mechanism, not only those directly concerned with economic acquisition, with irresistible force. Perhaps it will so determine them until the last ton of fossilized coal is burnt. In Baxter's view the care for external goods should only lie on the shoulders of the "saint like a cloak, which can be thrown aside at any moment". But fate decreed that the cloak should become an iron cage'. So contrary to what many might think, Weber could be every bit as economically deterministic as Marx. Not only that, his views about capitalism were sometimes hardly more than a stone's throw from Marx.

1 H.Marcuse at a Hegel conference in 1970. Quoted in Hoberman, *Sport and Ideology*, p.113.

2 B.Rigauer, (trans.A.Guttman), *Sport and Work*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1981). For a good critique of Rigauer and remarks of relevance about the neo-Marxist approach to sport, see Tony Mason, *Sport in Britain*, (Faber and Faber, London 1988), pp.73-7.

3 Rigauer, *Sport and Work*, p.1.

4 A.Gorz, *Socialism and Revolution*, (Allen Lane, London 1975), pp.199-203.

passive, productive or receptive, in working time and free time, he serves the system'.¹ Perhaps the best example of a sustained assault upon the repressive bastion of capitalist sport was made by Brohm. Brohm believes that sport contains all the values of traditional repressive bourgeois society. But not only that, sport is a 'libidinal substitute and a sublimation of aggressivity'. It provides an outlet for 'moral masochism'. It represents a 'veritable *ideological apparatus* of death. Physical torture, tolerated and put on as entertainment, is held up as politically neutral and culturally legitimate'.² Elsewhere sport is a means of cultural control and paternalism, used as a tool of oppression.³ It trains the work-force to operate according to the norms of capitalist society, and it helps to reproduce labour power.⁴ It is part of the all-encompassing engine of capitalism.

It has to be remembered that the work of these neo-Marxists was produced as polemic. Their role is to agitate, as well as educate people about the dangers of the false-consciousness that sport propagates. There is therefore by necessity very little written by them about the way in which the mass culture of sport is produced, and how the ideological values of the bourgeoisie are transmitted and imposed on the work-force.⁵ Neither is there very much suggestion of how sports developed historically. But, like the Figurationists, and Guttmann, it is unwise to wholly discount this disparate group. They identify certain conditions and trends in sport that demand explanation. The relentless search for records in top level sport, the extraordinary emphasis on winning, the perceived specialisation of sports are worth considering. But what really prevents the validity of Brohm and the others is the possibility that as well as having a reproductive role to play in relation to the means of production, labour power etc., it also has the potential to undermine the system. Why, might we ask, are Marxists and other socialists drawn towards sport, as well as repulsed by it? There is nothing that says that sport cannot be enjoyed on its own terms as a stimulating physical experience. Certainly sport contains ideologies that are counter-productive to the socialist struggle. However, the emphasis on community and other aspects may make it an ideal structure through which to attack capitalism. These themes will be returned to once a close bedfellow of the neo-Marxists has been examined.

1 H.Marcuse, *Counter Revolution and Revolt*, (Allen Lane, London 1972), p.14.

2 J.M.Brohm, *Sport - A Prison of Measured Time*, (Ink Links, London 1978), pp.26-8.

3 Brohm, *Sport - A Prison of Measured Time*, pp.38-41.

4 Brohm, *Sport - A Prison of Measured Time*, pp.55-6.

5 Although it has to be said that Brohm does lean towards a vague kind of Gramscianism, *Sport - A Prison of Measured Time*, pp.45-52, 53-6.

Hegemony or not hegemony ?

The theory of hegemony has been an absolutely crucial element in cultural studies. First developed by the great Italian Marxist Gramsci, and then dusted off for the consumption of historians of culture by the likes of Raymond Williams, ideas about the use of hegemony have become an important part of the debate on sport and society.¹ Gramsci's theory is ideal for this purpose. It concentrates on what is perceived as being the superstructure rather than the base, and consequently it avoids the trap of economic determinism which is supposed to be the greatest sin of Marx and Marxists.²

hegemony can be seen as a situation where the subordinate class lives its daily life in forms created by, or consistent with the interests of, the dominant class, and through this daily life acquires beliefs, motives and ways of thinking that serve to perpetuate the class structure.³

Hegemony then operates along-side relations of production, as a complimentary force to the repression of the work-place. The dominant class has physical and ideological means of control over the state and civil society. Churches and voluntary institutions serve to extend hegemony. Neither is the family immune in its bourgeois form. Hegemony is generative. Thus, its formation and maintenance is described as a process whereby:

the holders of power - whether by conscious policy or standing institutional arrangements - *resist the process of class formation* on the part of the labour force, and especially resist the development of a heightened class consciousness. Anything that serves to disorganise the working class, to disrupt class solidarity, or to contain or deflect the action of working-class groups, will then be a mechanism of hegemony.⁴

But one of the key limitations on hegemony is that because of the similarity of ^{the} social and economic situation of members of the working class this resistance to class formation is never entirely successful. Because of the nature of capitalism there is always tension in the work-place and around the labour market in general. More importantly, hegemony can be directly opposed, 'and there is a long history of groups

1 See in particular R. Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977), pp.108-114.

2 That is if one chooses to ignore the early works, especially the absolutely crucial *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, *The German Ideology*, and Engels' introduction to *The Thesis on Feuerbach* (as well as Marx's thesis itself).

3 Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.22.

4 Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.23.

and movements that have deliberately set themselves to follow a counter-hegemonic structure'.¹

The field of leisure studies was one of the first areas in historical discourse to utilise a Gramscian approach, specifically relating to the potential that it had for social control. By the late 1970s and early 1980s there were several works which had at their core the hegemonic potential of leisure, and less often sport.² Among these was Bailey's path-breaking *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*. However, it was in 1986 that the first full-length exposition of Gramscian hegemony and sport was published in Britain. John Hargreaves' *Sport, Power and Culture* utilised hegemony to demonstrate how sport had evolved in Britain, and what specific functions sport ideology had in repressing the working class. In so doing he managed to muddy the waters of class struggle.

Uncontroversially, Hargreaves believes that the creed of athleticism was fostered in the emerging public schools. In this his work follows that of Mangan. He sees the specific function of the schools as a point of integration between the old aristocracy and the new bourgeoisie. He feels that within the schools, sport could act as an agent of socialisation, inculcating the required values of Christian gentlemanliness, manliness and a sense of Englishness. Thus the ideology of sport is fundamentally changed.³ Following school the products of the system established their own sporting network and these old boys used this to reform and re-codify the 'traditional' sports. So far his explanation follows a similar line to Brookes, Dunning and Elias, even to the extent that

1 Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.23. I have used this text to illustrate hegemony because it is one of the clearest expositions of the theory. Gramsci developed his theory of hegemony while imprisoned by the Fascists in Italy. This is important because at times the clarity of explanation is, to say the least, muddy. In part this is a result of attempting to disguise the nature of his writing from the prison authorities, which led him to describe dialectical materialism as the 'philosophy of praxis'. At other times it may have been due to the nature of his imprisonment. Indeed, he was essentially sketching out a theory, possibly to be expounded upon later. As he died shortly after his release there has never been a fully evolved version. It also has to be remembered that hegemony theory is not designed as a tool of social science. Specifically, the aim was to demonstrate that the working class could only gain power if they gained hegemony. Working-class hegemony was then to become a means to a revolutionary end. The Communist party was to have a crucial role in this, as it was its duty to act as the 'new prince', a Machiavellian agent bent on imposing its hegemony on the working class and then the whole of society. See Q.Hoare and G.Nowell Smith (eds.,trans.), *Antonio Gramsci. Selections from Prison Notebooks*, (Lawrence and Wishart, London 1986), esp. 'The Modern Prince'. For the life of Gramsci and a lucid introduction to the theory of hegemony see J.Joll, *Gramsci*, (Fontana, London 1983).

2 See especially E. and S.Yeo, *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914: Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure*, (Harvester, Brighton 1981).

3 J.Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture. A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain*, (Polity Press, Cambridge 1987), pp.38-45.

he cites the 'civilizing process' as part of the new sporting movement.¹ But it is in his explanation of the imposition of the hegemonic ideology of sport that Hargreaves is extraordinary. Initially, in his view, attempts were made through voluntary organisations, in particular the Volunteers. This strategy failed.² Popular sports and pastimes continued to survive in the face of the bourgeois onslaught, although sections of the 'respectable' working class, the labour aristocrats and the petty-Bourgeoisie, supported the dominant class in their battle against the 'traditional' pastimes.³ Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie remained undeterred and continued to attempt to win the hearts and minds of the working-class through sporting hegemony. They persisted in their attempts to achieve this through organisations like the YMCA, Sunday Schools, working men's clubs, Volunteers, Boy's Brigade, and a myriad of other associations. Still, Hargreaves maintains that even in the 1890s hegemony had not been achieved.⁴ However, by the First World War hegemony was at last in place because by the end of 1914 'half a million men had enlisted via football organisations. Almost 50 per cent of the total number of volunteers in that year'.⁵ What a contribution sport had made and how:

The dominant class's control and influence over working-class people's free time which was manifested in sports was effective not because there was a ruling-class master plan, which was inexorably put into practice, but because the dominant groups' responses were not monolithic, because the working-class was internally divided and, in different ways, was willing to tune into the wavelengths upon which dominant groups were broadcasting.⁶

It is as if some bourgeois magician has waved his wand and shouted the magic words: 'hey presto! let there be hegemony'. And there was.

Most historians have been slightly more pragmatic with their use of hegemony.⁷ This is certainly the case with Brian Stoddart working in Australian sport history.

1 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.40.

2 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.50.

3 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.50-6.

4 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.63-4.

5 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.84.

6 Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.85.

7 For example, P.Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England. Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control, 1830-1885*, (Methuen, London 1987), pp.176-88. See especially: 'In part, the rationalisation which overtook working-class recreation - the regular programming of sport, for example, and the stabilising of the week-end break - represented an internal adjustment to the irreversible pressures on time, space and energy brought by a modern industrial society. In part rationalisation was an extension of existing disciplines in working-class life, an amplification of the rules and regulations that had long ordered the good fellowship of the friendly societies. Within these constraints the working classes maintained a considerable autonomy of style and jurisdiction'. This

Stoddart undoubtedly sees a role for hegemony in the development of sports in the Australian class structure. Thus he says from a Gramscian slant

Sport has been a central agency, and a conservative one. It has raised, formed and preserved social expectations, attitudes, behaviours, standards and codes...those qualities it cultivates have been highly prized for the contributions they make to conservative notions of social progress. Their passing, modification or transgression has inevitably been marked by widespread regret.¹

By this we must take him to mean that sport acted to retard working-class consciousness by over-laying it with unhealthy doses of bourgeois/dominant class conservative (or liberal perhaps?) ideology. In this he follows the line of Connell and Irving, whose sole contribution to the sports debate was to briefly sketch out the following schema:

Huge crowds went to regattas, athletic meetings and cricket and football matches, and whether sponsored by businessmen for profit or by clubs of businessmen for more altruistic ends, their effect was hegemonic in its stress on colonial or national identification.²

Thus by making the masses identify with these ideologies, they were in essence preventing class-formation, or rather stunting its growth. Nevertheless, because Stoddart is healthily eclectic, hegemonic theory is one part of a much larger structure that sees in sport the potential to be one of the building blocks of the class.³

Hegemony and theories relating to social control have been attacked on several levels. Obviously, any theory that comes under the general category of the left

seems altogether more subtle than Hargreaves. Also see J.Clarke and C.Critcher, *The Devil Makes Work. Leisure In Capitalist Britain*, (Macmillan, Basingstoke 1985), pp.62-71; H.Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, c.1780-c.1880*, (Croom Helm, London 1980), p.196; R.J.Morris, 'Clubs, Societies and Associations', in F.M.L.Thompson, *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, - Social Agencies and Institutions*, Vol.3, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990), has an altogether more adaptable approach to voluntary associations and sports. For example, he believes that working men took over the Clubs and Institute Union, and unlike Hargreaves he sees Soccer as a victory for the working class, while Rugby was a score-draw (p.418). His view of the remaking of the working-class is considerably more sophisticated too.

1 B.Stoddart, 'The Hidden Influence of Sport', in V.Burgmann and J.Lee, *Constructing a Culture. A People's History of Australia since 1788*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic. 1988), p.135. Also see B.Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, pp.13-14 and 22, although in this particular case he might have developed the theme further. Also note the significance of using the word 'hidden', which seems to denote a Gramscian construction, i.e. he believes that sport's influence is conservative and insidious.

2 Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.127.

3 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, pp.8-14, and ch.2. His ideas on the generative nature of sport will be returned to below when the interpretation of sport as a building block of class will be discussed.

historiography is a potential target for conservative historians' derision. But more interesting and far-reaching are the criticisms that have been made by those who are broadly aligned with them. It has been radical historians who have taken the most exception, particularly because they feel that hegemony does not allow for the describing of the full range of working-class experience and class formation. The most stinging of these attacks was framed by Gareth Stedman-Jones in 1977 in an article that addressed the origins of the theories about social control. 'Class expression versus social control' attacked on several fronts. Firstly he pin-pointed a lack of examination of women and leisure, and then he went on to a much larger question of the portrayal of the working-class by those who used social control as a model:

The sharply delineated foreground is occupied by puritan, methodist and evangelical moral reformers, gentry deciding where to place their patronage, prescient magistrates, calculating employers, prurient municipal élites, entrepreneurial publicans and rationalising merchants of leisure. Behind this obtrusive phalanx, we can just make out the blurred and rather undifferentiated features of the rural and urban masses.¹

Jones believed that there was an inadequate amount of studies examining active working class attempts to develop and determine their own leisure time, leading to an impression that class conflict has been one-sided in England. The reason that this occurred was that historians had placed too much faith in the model of social control, which he believed owed far more in its roots to the functionalism of Parsons than to any Marxist theory. Social control assumed that there was a static equilibrium not a process of dialectical materialism.² Of hegemony theory proper he felt that it was fine as far as it went. It enabled the historian to 'look at institutions through which the ruling class ideology is transmitted', but 'it can give a tautological answer if it is used to explain the absence of revolutionary proletarian class consciousness'.³ What Jones was really driving at was that he believed that the study of leisure on its own was dangerous because it detracted from the main arena of struggle that surrounded the work place and the extraction of labour from labour power.⁴

In some senses Jones missed the point. He appears to be suggesting that leisure did not have the same inherent antagonisms as the forces of production. This neat separation between work and leisure seems to ignore what economists have known for

1 G.Stedman-Jones, 'Class Expression Versus Social Control ? A Critique of Recent Trends in the Social History of "Leisure"', *History Workshop* 4 (1977), p.163.

2 Stedman-Jones, 'Class Expression Versus Social Control ?', pp.164-7.

3 Stedman-Jones, 'Class Expression Versus Social Control ?', p.168.

4 Stedman-Jones, 'Class Expression Versus Social Control ?', p.169.

some time; leisure-time can become part of the battle between employer and employee over non-pecuniary wages. Once there is a restriction on the number of hours that employees have to work there will always be a trade-off between earning greater wages and having more leisure time. Equally, for the employer, he must restrict/discipline the work force, preventing them from taking too much leisure time, possibly even offering them higher wages as an incentive against this. Otherwise he has to accept a certain level of absenteeism at certain times. Leisure therefore can be built into a wages-prices model.¹ Likewise, E.P.Thompson's 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism' demonstrates how a battle can be fought over imposing discipline on a work-force, and part of that battle was over leisure time.² One question that Jones might have asked is how far did work end when the worker went home? How far was his leisure delimited by capitalism? Despite this, his criticisms of theories of social control and hegemony were and still are valid. As he points out, research has shown that football crowds in Glasgow were particularly large before the First World War. Employing the theory of Hargreaves, for example, we might expect to find that the workers were particularly docile. They were not.³ This leads us into other territory, for it is possible to say that since the factory as the main basis of production creates work that is social, and since it is this that partially produces revolutionary consciousness, why is it not possible for that consciousness to be produced at other mass social gatherings like a football match?⁴

1 C.Gratton and P.Taylor, *Sport and Recreation. An Economic Analysis*, (E.F.Spon, London 1985), built such a model. However, in the main it was meant to represent the contemporary relationship between work, leisure and recreation. It is possible that a more sophisticated model of the 'income/leisure trade-off' could be developed to cope with nineteenth century conditions (pp. 19-22).

2 Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', p.305.

3 Stedman-Jones, 'Class Expression Versus Social Control?', p.169. Jones' arguments have been countered to some extent by the social control lobby. A.P.Donajrodzki, *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (Croom Helm, London 1977), pp.9-24, argues that Gramscianism and social control models that have their origin in functionalism are not entirely incompatible. There is an 'ideological flexibility' about the concept (p.14). Indeed, there is an admirable breadth and range of the studies in this volume. Nevertheless, I do not believe that this diminishes criticisms, or at least reservations, about the use of social control and hegemony theory. Jones was also criticised in a roundabout way by the Yeos, who had been his main original targets: E. and S.Yeo, (ed.), 'Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus Class and Struggle' and 'Perceived Patterns: Competition and Licence Versus Class and Struggle', in E. and S. Yeo (eds.), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914*. There was one direct criticism of Jones in these essays (p.145), apart from the parody implicit in the title. I think that a sentence like 'To collapse needs into the manner of their meeting, forms into functions and effects into causes is to concede everything to Things as They Are (must be)' (p.128), speaks for itself, although such criticism should not extend to V.Gammon, '"Babylonian Performances": The Rise and Suppression of Popular Church Music, 1660-1870', pp.62-88, or many of the other interesting contributions in the book.

4 Mason, *Association Football*, ch.8, pp.222-42 explores, among other things, the possibility that the growth of mass spectating at football matches led to increased community or local consciousness on

If we look specifically at the hegemonic potential of sport we see that it is even less likely than in leisure in general. The problem with Hargreaves is that he is never able to explore how the ideological mechanisms functioned. We know that the ideology propagated by cricket and rugby was produced by the dominant class.¹ We know that it emphasised such things as class-conciliation and 'fair play'. But we do not, and can never know how successfully they were deployed in attempting to diminish working-class consciousness. The favourite mechanisms of Hargreaves are voluntary institutions. But how many working people were touched by these? Arguably few I think. And not only that, there is considerable evidence that there was a high degree of resistance and outright rejection by working people.² Equally, in the larrikin/hooligan culture of fragments of working-class youth there was complete rejection of bourgeois values that was perceived to be a considerable threat to the 'equilibrium' of society.³ Even football, whose code and meanings were rapidly transformed, seems to be a refutation of the hegemonic argument.⁴ It is wise to recall Holt's criticisms of hegemony theory:

the part of the working-class. Although this might have been detrimental to the growth of working-class consciousness it did produce some sort of common cultural bond that excluded, to an extent, the middle-class.

1 The use of the term dominant class is extensive throughout this thesis. Its usage is not to be taken as an adherence to Gramscian theory. It broadly denotes the coalition of classes that held power, whether economic, social or political. In the Victorian era this refers in part to what might more normally be termed the élite sections of the middle classes, but recognises as well that the landed élite still held a considerable amount of political and social power. The term subordinate class is used to denote those groups, most specifically and importantly the working class, whose relationship to the dominant class was one of potential antagonism as they possessed neither the economic or political resources of the dominant class. Nevertheless, both classes should not be regarded as static entities, or completely closed. The process of class formation and the relationship between the classes was constantly shifting and frequently being redefined.

2 J.Springhall, *Youth, Society and Empire. British Youth Movements, 1883-1940*, (Croom Helm, London 1977), pp.88-9. In his local study of a Boy's Brigade company in Enfield he notes that there was a lot of hostility towards it in the early years. This hostility usually took the form of jeers, flying stones and bottles. At the Scouts' initiation he notes that the same thing occurred (p.90). He also demonstrates that with the Boy Scouts in particular there was often disillusion when it was discovered that 'it was often too expensive a game, for the sons of unemployed or unskilled workers to play', surely the two groups who were most in need of control (p.91). Hargreaves used Springhall's work for much of his evidence, but he obviously ignored the codicil that 'there is little evidence to suggest that the actual form his [Baden-Powell] method of training assumed had any impact on the subsequent ethical or social behaviour of its members' (p.123).

3 See G.Pearson, *Hooligan. A History of Respectable Fears*, (Macmillan, Basingstoke 1990), for example pp.65, 86 and 94.

4 P.McIntosh, *Fair Play. Ethics in Sport and Education*, (Heinemann, London 1979), ch.9, based on the work of K.Heinila clearly demonstrates that the football players observe a code of conduct which is acceptable to them, but not necessarily acceptable to what is perceived as the moral spirit of the game.

The claims for sport as a tool for the moral leadership by the bourgeoisie of a divided working class needs to be treated with great caution. Which sports? When? How? The agencies of hegemony have to be made clear. As the debate over Victorian social control revealed, it is not enough to show that there were individuals with the *intention* of exercising control over the workers. It has to be established that some kind of moral influence was in fact exercised. The hegemonic argument cleverly accepts that such control was only partially and incompletely achieved, and in fact interprets this cultural independence as 'resistance', thereby providing further proof of the strength of the concept. We are presented with a closed system of thought which can account for all manner of conflicting interests and responses.¹

Sport and Class formation

There are, as is implicit in the argument so far, other ways to look at the question of class and sport in the nineteenth century. These ways are to examine the potential within sport to be part of the generative process of class formation. If football is examined without utilising hegemony or social control theories, it is still possible to present a case for the game making a large impression on the class structure. Initially, the reorganisation of football creates governing bodies with football clubs following in the vanguard. At all levels of the game it has the potential to structure partially the production and reproduction of class. Membership of governing bodies gives status to agents within their class, as well as power over law-making and conduct. The control of a football club may serve the same function at the local level, with businessmen using their personal ownership to enhance their status within the local community. Professional players are tied to the club by contract; they produce football that can be sold as a commodity, and like other labourers receive a wage. Spectators identify with the club, demanding, or at least wanting, victory. They, the consumers, are from a similar social background. Their community and class identity are enhanced by the experience of a football culture which was incorporated into a more general working-

Their judgements are structured placing an emphasis on victory 'without any absolute commitment to observe the rules or even equalised conditions for competition'. (p.133). It seems that this code was observed by players and spectators by the late nineteenth century, Mason, *Association Football*, pp.232-33.

¹ Holt, *Sport and the British*, p.364. Tony Mason also argues compulsively in 'Afterword', in Tony Mason (ed.), *Sport in Britain. A Social History*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1989), p.349, that sport should be kept in perspective. Many people 'perhaps the majority, are largely untouched by it: and as an effective means of social control sport must be less important than economics or politics'.

class culture from the late nineteenth century.¹ At all levels then this particular sport has the potential to enhance, power, status and consciousness.

Having already discussed the possibility that sport can solidify working class communities and culture, it is necessary to turn to the dominant class to see what sport had to offer them apart from fitness. In this context it is necessary to look at the work of two particular scholars: Richard Gruneau and Brian Stoddart. Richard Gruneau has demonstrated that theories extracted from traditional Marxism and its bastardised forms, like structuralism, are, if anything, less satisfactory than hegemony,² as at least the

1 S.G.Jones, *Sport, Politics and the Working Class. Organised Labour and Sport in Inter-War Britain*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1988), p.24. He admits that the production and control over their own culture was delimited by their existence within the framework of capitalism. Nevertheless, despite the economic and cultural power of the bourgeoisie who reorganised and developed sport, as well as creating the infrastructure, the working class were able to place their imprint on sport. Indeed, he calls this a process of colonisation. (p.34); R.J.Holt, 'Football and the Urban Way of Life in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in Mangan, *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, p.68-79. Among other things Holt forcefully argues that if football was an opiate 'it was a democratic one - of the people, by the people for the people' (p.68), as well as acting as a means of working-class socialization (p.72).

2 R.Gruneau, 'Sport and the Debate on the State', in R.Gruneau, H.Cantelon, *Sport, Culture, and the Modern State*, (Toronto, 1982). While examining the traditional Marxist approach to sport, he finds it too mechanistic in the way in which it 'reduces cultural formations to passive reflections of reality', rather than a 'meaningful dramatization of it'. Presumably, he means by this that he does not believe that sport simply reflects, or even reproduces, the divisions and alienations, of capitalist society. At the same time, he criticises Marxist and neo-Marxist theories which propound the idea that the dominant class exercises complete control over a subordinate class, partially through the use of sport. Thus he says that the assumptions that 'participants in working class culture who consume sport, are somehow unreflective dupes' or that 'a deep interest in sport is incompatible with...militant trade unionism and the pursuit of class struggle' are unreasonable. On all these counts he has assessed the problems of this type of approach in a very calculated manner, although nowhere does he actually deal with any of the neo-Marxist ideas about sport increasing the 'alienation' of the working class, and retarding working class consciousness, perhaps because these theories too seem to demand the assumption that the working class is completely and irreparably dominated by a ruling class. (pp.22-5). His objections to the approach of the Structuralist theoreticians, is more complex, presumably arising from the opaque and oblique nature of the Structuralist discourse itself. As regards the input of this group to sport sociology and history, the basis of the argument seems to settle on the relationship between the state and society. Thus, the state stresses its own neutrality, which becomes 'perceived' by people in civil society. This is expressed and reproduced through sport. Gruneau feels that the Structuralist case confuses 'class power' and 'state power', and that the theory requires 'a set of assertions about functional interdependence...every bit as unreasonable as any functionalist sociologist'. His main objection, however, seems to be that 'meaningful cultural creations' are reduced 'to a purely reproductive status', and are therefore not at all adequate for analytic purposes (pp.26-7). Again, this assessment, which is not far removed from his conclusions about Marxism, is acceptable. But on a deeper level one must question the whole basis of Structuralism, which seems to defy the logic of gravity in its efforts to utilise concepts like 'relative autonomy'. These are used in the manner of a conjuring trick, rather than a tool of historical analysis. By examining the antagonism between the 'dominant' and 'subordinate' classes, they slip into ahistorical territory, and obscure the nature of class struggle itself. See, for a coherent analysis of the problems with Structuralism, as well as a stinging rebuttal of Structuralist discourse, E.P.Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory*, (Merlin, London 1978), pp.196-7.

latter allows for a degree of mediation and resistance from below. Gruneau's main contribution to the debate is, however, related to his own beliefs in the 'generative' nature of sport within society. It is worth looking at Gruneau's attitudes because they are particularly relevant to the situation in Eastern Australia during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, although there is also relevance to the situation in Britain.

Gruneau does believe in half the Gramscian equation for sport. In other words he believes that sport does have some sort of hegemonic function. He says that often it has been fundamentally connected with the expression of dominant class interests in the development of capitalism, and he notes a strong sense in which the 'traditions, styles and major practices' of a given sport, 'its meanings and metaphoric qualities can be logically, abstractly, connected to the constitutive logic of the capitalist mode of production'. He then poses the question: 'have these connections always been present and clearly defined in the industrial development of sport in capitalist society?', and promptly answers it with a qualified 'no'. Furthermore he states:

Sports are historically constituted and contested features of human experience and their meanings, institutional shape, relations to class and the state are literally defined by the struggles that have characterized lived social experience at different historical moments. In this way it can be argued that the changing definition and organization of sport in the development of the capitalist societies is indissolubly connected to class conflicts and the conflicting cultural creations of different classes. It is clear...that [sport] had the potential to take on a set of oppositional meanings within the developing bourgeois Hegemony. There is no doubt that the struggle between class fractions within the bourgeoisie over the social definition and control of sport in the nineteenth^{century} was an active process of contesting instrumentalities rather than a simple expression of bourgeois dominance.¹

Three elements of relevance can be drawn from this to aid the construction of a framework of analysis. Firstly, class is important, and the dominant class does attempt to use sport as a hegemonic strategy for ideological imposition on a subordinate class. Secondly, while some of the subordinate class may resist this hegemony, others may use it for their own ends and develop an 'oppositional' culture, while, more importantly, some may reject it out of hand, and develop an autonomous/independent culture developed directly out of their lived experience, but marginally delimited by the structure of capitalism. Thirdly, and extremely important from the perspective of this thesis as a study of the dominant class and its actions in cricket, is that the dominant

¹ Gruneau, 'Sport and the Debate on the State', pp.27-8.

class is fragmented into 'class fractions', which may compete to control sport, because they perceive that the ideology of sport is a valuable and legitimating possession.¹

Gruneau's approach to sport influenced Stoddart in his writing on sport in Australian culture. Just as Gruneau believes that sport has always been part and parcel of the process of class formation in Canada, so Stoddart believes that it fulfils this function in Australia.² Thus he comments:

The growth of cities such as Sydney and Melbourne along with the complex of social and economic relations within them, saw sport strengthen its claims as a key social institution in Australia, embedded in the class and status make-up of the growing communities. Between the 1850s and the 1880s, colonial sport experienced far-reaching changes determined by general social change and centred upon social utility, social ordering, and economic ordering.³

This method of analysis led him to examine the mythology of Australian sport, and challenge assumptions about its conservative nature and rigid class definitions.⁴ One of the areas that Stoddart concentrates upon is the use that people made of social institutions/clubs. As he says, different sports could attain different class and status connotations.⁵ With cricket this was located somewhere between horse-racing at the top end of the spectrum and trotting at the lower end. Nevertheless, within one sport there could be a different social range of clubs, which also might represent different communities. Groups that found it hard to enter exclusive institutions might create their own. Other institutions or voluntary associations will actively seek to exclude those that are believed to be socially undesirable. The potential that this has for class formation is that different institutions could act as foci or demarcation zones both for those that were already established at the pinnacle of the social structure, as well as for the socially aspirant.⁶ While the implications of this are clear for Australian society they might appear less so for Britain. Nevertheless it will be argued that the emphasis placed on social institutions in producing part of the fabric of class is not mis-placed.

What Gruneau, and to a lesser extent Stoddart, offer is a system which sees sport clearly defined in the context of class but allows it a productive role outside of the

1 These themes are elaborated in R.Gruneau, *Class, Sports and Social Development*, which is a critique of sport sociology and an examination of the historical structuring of Canadian sports.

2 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, p.8.

3 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, p.17.

4 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, pp.33-55.

5 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, p.47.

6 See B.Stoddart, 'Sport and Society 1890-1940. A Foray', in C.T.Stannage (ed.), *A New History of Western Australia*, (University of Western Australia Press, Perth 1981), pp.652-61.

heuristic cell of hegemony. Importantly the theory can be seen as complimentary to that of Frank Parkin on social closure and class formation. Parkin used the Weberian concept of social closure which 'means the process by which social collectivities seek to maximize rewards by restricting access to resources and opportunities to a limited circle of eligibles. This entails the singling out of certain social or physical attributes as the justificatory basis of exclusion'. Weber concentrated on the use of social closure for the use of maximizing economic opportunities but Parkin believed that this could be extended to encompass other forms of collective action.¹ Parkin is specifically interested in the paradox surrounding the closure of the bourgeois class and sees that this is achieved by institutions surrounding the preservation of private property, and academic or professional qualifications and credentials.² Informal social institutions are not considered. However, it is worth considering the idea of social closure within this broader sphere.

The use of generative theory will be crucial to the execution of this thesis. Its concentration on the part that sport has to play in the production and reproduction of class is invaluable. Equally it gives an insight into the importance of a project based upon two elite institutions who practised a form of social closure. However, before moving on to other themes that sport historians have explored it is worth considering the use that the dominant ideology of cricket had for the members of the two clubs. For, although the hegemonic use of cricket should be under-played, there was still an important use for the ideology of cricket.

Dominant class, dominant ideology

Cricket's ideology with its emphasis on fair play and class conciliation was produced and upheld by members of the dominant class. In this sense, because they believed that the ethos of cricket represented some sort of truth, they felt that it was a code which should be upheld by all sections of society. It is easy to see that this has potential hegemonic implications. It is correct, as well, that certain sections of the subordinate class supported the implications of cricket's ethos, especially those that played as professionals alongside amateurs. Nevertheless, it is hard to see that it had real importance besides other institutions which undoubtedly fulfilled some sort of hegemonic function, for example the ideology of the rule of law and even certain conceptions of nationalism. Equally the means of transmitting this particular ideology

1 F.Parkin, 'Social Closure and Class Formation', in Giddens and Held, *Classes, Power and Conflict*, pp.175-6.

2 F.Parkin, 'Social Closure and Class Formation', p.178.

were weak, except in the schools that served the dominant class itself. What function then did cricket have as a dominant ideology?

Abercrombie, Hills and Turner, in *The Dominant Ideology Thesis* completely rejected the main premise of hegemony and social control. Having described the basis of the thesis with its roots in Gramsci, Habermas and Althusser *et al.*, they question whether it had any function as a means of incorporating the working class and creating a stable system of capitalism. In the ages of feudalism and early capitalism they believe that the dominant class did have a dominant ideology, but that the means of transmission of this ideology were so weak as to be ineffective. In late capitalism the means of transmission were a lot stronger, especially with the development of compulsory education, nevertheless the dominant ideology was a lot weaker, meaning that there could only be a very fragmentary incorporation. Instead they reject the notion of capitalism as predominantly stable, and concentrate on the institutions, practices and social relations which uphold the power of the dominant class, like property, the family and the practice of inheritance.¹ What then, they ask, was the function of a dominant ideology? The answer is that it served to incorporate the dominant class itself particularly in the eras of feudalism and early capitalism.²

Arguably this has a great importance for the study of cricket as an ideological tool, although Abercrombie etc., are specifically interested in social and productive relations. Nevertheless it is helpful to look at cricket as a unifying element in dominant class culture during this period, both materially and ideologically. For example, cricket's centrality to the curriculum of the public schools indicates the social

1 N.Abercrombie, S.Hills and B.S.Turner, *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1980). This is a very provocative book, especially in its assertion that Weber and Durkheim stand in closer relationship to Marx than the neo-Functionalist school headed by Parson's (p.31). Nevertheless, they notice, like Stedman-Jones, that there is an implicit dominant ideology thesis in both the Marxian school and that of the neo-Functionalists (chapter 2). Their almost absolute rejection of the dominant ideology thesis is perhaps over-stated, nevertheless, they identify its major weakness, the lack of means of transmission powerful enough to overcome the contradictions within the structure of capitalism (e.g., p.125, on Sunday schools).

2 Abercrombie, Hills and Turner, *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*, p.157. This is not to say that I believe that Abercrombie, etc., were completely right. Despite the weakness of the means of transmitting dominant class ideology there were still opportunities for propagating it. High levels of literacy may have influenced this although it was not until the late nineteenth century that the media becomes a crucial mechanism of ideological transmission. There are certainly ideologies that could be regarded as hegemonic, like the ideology of the rule of law (as opposed to the actual concrete rule of law) and conceptions of nationalism. Nevertheless, what is implicit in this chapter is that the hegemonic impact of such things can only have been partial at the very most, especially when the common experiences of the work-place were put up against these things. It is also crucial to understand that cricket, as with the rest of sport, as an instrument of hegemony, was more or less a non-starter, while the development of leisure seems to demonstrate that victory, partial or whole, frequently went to the working class.

* in the struggle over hegemony

importance it had for the emergent dominant class. Equally, a club with the social implications of the Marylebone, or indeed the Melbourne, could be seen as offering opportunities for incorporation, consolidation or cohesion by utilising the social importance of their position within the hierarchy of the game. Their very position within this spectrum was determined by the relationship between the mythologies/traditions of the club and the historical mythologies/traditions that lie at the very heart of cricket's ideology. Seen in the context of the invention of tradition this has great significance.¹ The clubs as voluntary associations, by limiting membership through social/status qualifications, at the very least attempted to establish themselves as important social institutions within the boundaries of class. Membership of either club was a mark of acceptance by a group of peers, who generally held the same, or similar views about cricket and society. Indeed, their views about society were frequently defined by their views about cricket. Class-conciliation could be a watchword within cricket as long as it existed within a sharply delineated class structure with themselves at the top controlling those beneath them. The ideology of cricket legitimated their position because they invented and controlled it. Not surprisingly, they attempted to establish an important place within this ideology by setting their clubs up at the pinnacle of the structure. In both instances the success or failure of these associations was the result of the reactions of other members of the dominant class who were excluded by choice or by force, and who challenged the order that they had attempted to create. The dominant ideology of cricket had the potential to be part of the generation of class, just as the membership of a club had the potential to demarcate along status lines the position of an individual within the class-structure. Given the position that these clubs occupied within cricket and its history it is possible to see them as being part of the ideology of the game as well as being located within the concrete structure.²

1 See Hobsbawm and Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, p.9. In the 'Introduction' Hobsbawm talks about three overlapping types of invented tradition which fit the examination of cricket and the two cricket clubs perfectly: the first is created to establish or symbolise social cohesion or the membership of groups and real or artificial communities; the second establishes or legitimizes institutions, status or relations of authority; and the third whose main purpose was socialization, the inculcation of beliefs, value systems and conventions of behaviour. When the invention of tradition is talked about in this thesis these interlocking descriptions are what is being referred to.

2 In a sense this reflects ideas about voluntary societies that have been developed by R.J.Morris, especially in 'Voluntary Societies and the British Urban Elite, 1780-1850: An Analysis', *Historical Journal*, Vol.26 (1983). However, in his study of Leeds, Newcastle and Edinburgh Morris concentrates on institutions like the Society for the Suppression of Vice, which were essentially for social improvement ends. Obviously cricket clubs did not have the same purpose, and as will be seen were generally more socially closed than Voluntary societies. It is therefore hard to fit them into Morris' flow-diagram of development (p.107), although the Marylebone CC develops along a similar trajectory.

Nation and Empire

Apart from class and society there are two other themes that need to be looked at in the context of this thesis. The first, nation and empire, is central to the general imperial relationship between Britain and Australia within the context of cricket. As this is a study of cricket, class and colonialism it is necessary to understand the interpretations historians have laid upon this particular aspect of the imperial cultural bond. The second, gender, is less relevant to the general themes of this thesis, but is important background information.

Anglo-Saxonism

A crucial part of the ideology of cricket was that it was essentially Anglo-Saxon in character. Few historians have concentrated on this important aspect of the ideology of the game although some have commented upon it. For example, a typical statement about cricket, race and nationality was made by Brookes when he said that by the beginning of the twentieth century 'cricket had become as much a part of English life as Queen Victoria herself'.¹ Equally the Anglo-Saxon nature of cricket is an implicit part of theories about cricket, imperialism, and colonial nationalism, especially in the work of Stoddart and Mandle.² Nevertheless, there have been few studies of what cricket meant to the English.

The one major exception to this is Holt in Chapter 4 of *Sport and the British* on 'Empire and Nation'. In this he not only explores the spread of sport to the Empire, but he also looks at the uses that sport had for the constituent nationalities of the British Isles. Thus he examined various forms of Celtic Nationalism, but also looked at the relationship between sport and the English. He acknowledges that during the nineteenth century there was a creation of a specifically English culture which ranged 'from an interest in the purity of the English language and its literature to music, folklore, landscape, and the idea of games as the embodiment of the English spirit'. Then

But like the voluntary societies, both cricket clubs were urban based phenomena, while the Melbourne CC was predominantly drawn from what might be termed the emergent Australian middle class (which in fact was the emergent Australian dominant/ruling class in social and economic terms).

1 Brookes, *English Cricket*, p.3.

2 B.Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire: A Framework for Analysis', in D.Benning (ed.), *Sport and Imperialism. The Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference of the British Society of Sports History (BSSH)*, (BSSH, North Staffs 1986); Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century'. Of course, the Englishness of cricket is also implicit in C.L.R.James, *Beyond a Boundary*, (Stanley Paul, London 1986), although the book also describes the way in which it cricket became acculturated in the West Indies.

commenting upon the drive for respectability and the rise of muscular Christianity, he says that physical combat was replaced as a mark of Englishness by cricket. This process was identifiable in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*.¹ The character of cricket became enshrouded in the mystique of Englishness. It was perceived to be as English as the Established church and the village green, two of the institutions it became mythologically associated with.² Thus it became part of a more general Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity. It was from this that it derived its authority as the imperial game, while it was conceptions of Englishness interacting with developing Australian nationalism that defined antipodean attitudes.

Australian Nation/Nationalism; British Loyalties/Imperialism

Of all themes the one that has appealed most to historians of Australian cricket, the relationship between nation and empire as manifested through the game itself, has been the most popular. This is hardly surprising given the fact that cricket is the most universal sport in Australia and provides the country with its best opportunity of contending for honours with the old enemy England. Neither is it surprising that the relationship between cricket and Australian nationalism should be one of the first themes to be examined in genuinely historical terms, when it is considered that Australia's national identity has been one of the preoccupations of Australian historians since the 1950s.³ The seminal work in this field is Mandle's 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', which explored the symbiotic relationship between Australia and the mother country during the second half of the nineteenth century. By examining the reaction in the colonies to the visits of English touring teams and the doings of Australian XIs in Britain, Mandle discerned that there were four different phases in the development of Australian Nationalism. The first phase was supposedly characterised by humility and deference, and a desire to demonstrate that British stock had not deteriorated under the twin perils of Australia's different climate and the unspoken burden of convictism. The second phase was marked by a growing confidence manifested at first during the 1870s when it became apparent that England, as a cricket team, could be beaten. The third phase is one that Mandle identifies with a period of slackness during the 1880s, when a new era of self-criticism arose due to a lack of success and the mercenary attitudes of some of the Australian players. Finally, Mandle looks to the 1890s, where he sees a revival of interest in the fortunes of cricket

¹ Holt, *Sport and the British*, p. 263.

² Holt, *Sport and the British*, pp. 263-6.

³ E.g., R.Ward, *The Australian Legend*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1965); H.McQueen, *A New Britannia: An Argument Concerning the Social Origins of Australian Radicalism*, (Penguin, Ringwood Vic., 1989).

developing into a swaggering, even arrogant confidence which 'held up as an example of what Federation and co-operation might do and what nationhood had already achieved'.¹

Mandle's work was extremely influential, not just because it gave impetus to the study of cricket in a serious academic sense. It helped to define what would become the serious pre-occupation of many historians when they came to examine the game. Mandle, a self-confessed nationalist, saw cricket's main function in nineteenth-century Australian society as helping to define what Australia and Australians had become. This is not to say that he did not recognise cricket's significance within the social structure of Australia and the use that some people felt that it had as a tool of social control. Indeed, he recognises a relationship between cricket, muscular Christianity and militarism, as well as the 'audience consciousness' of the spectator.² However, the nationalist aspect was the single most important aspect for Mandle.

Among other historians who have examined the relationship between cricket and nationalism, Noel McLachlan re-iterates the Mandle-line, in his book *Waiting for the Revolution*, with the small reservation that:

certainly Test cricket encouraged the habit of thinking as an Australian, but the more frequent inter-colonial matches perhaps the opposite. Its [Cricket's] role is devilishly difficult to measure, but my guess is that it was worth a few votes at the very least for federation. Beyond that I can't go.³

This follows three pages that synthesize Mandle's arguments about cricket. However, McLachlan was right to point out the importance of inter-colonial rivalries as this was one of the crucial themes. But as will be seen this view of Australian cricket is inexcusable in its simplicity, following, as it does, more complex work by other historians on nationalism in general, and cricket in particular.

The flip-side of the Nationalist/Kangaroo tail, was the loyalist/Queen's head. Looking at cricket as one of the super-glues that bonded the white dominions together has been another area that historians have explored in detail, and is a logical outcome of an examination of nationalism. Many historians, when regarding the relationship between Britain and Australia in cricketing, as well as the wider non-cricketing sphere, have been drawn towards the paradoxical love-hate relationship between mother and

1 Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', pp.225-6.

2 Mandle, 'The Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century', pp.522-7.

3 McLachlan, *Waiting for The Revolution*, p.156. McLachlan's work is littered with post-syntactical constructions.

sibling: at one time, as in the Sudan crisis of 1885, the expression of filial devotion; and, at another, a nationalist fervour, expressing itself culturally in the nationalist poets, and politically in a quasi-Australian Imperialism during the 1880s. As Cole demonstrates in his article 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship', there is nothing particularly paradoxical about this.¹ Cole's piece was produced in the wake of the boom in race and ethnocentric studies in the late 1960s and early 70s, and it examined Australian nationalism and imperial loyalty in terms of different layers of ethnocentric solidarity. Thus he equates Australian nationalism with Australian ethnocentrism, which he believed could exist comfortably besides a more general imperial loyalty and love of the mother country as expressed through Anglo-Saxon racial ethnocentricity and racist ideology which was an out-pouring of an even more general ideology of the paramountcy of the Caucasian race. On the negative side, Cole's article does overstep the boundaries of historical analysis and strays into areas of ahistorical functionalism, which tread a line dangerously close to racism.² Despite this his analysis helps to explain why the ideas of Mandle were too cosy. The simple facts are that these different loyalties did co-exist together, and that there was no distinct lineal progression towards the development of Australian nationalism and ideas of nationhood. Indeed, the pattern is of a more cyclical nature than Mandle suggests, and probably never developed to the extent he proposes, because of the co-existence of these other loyalties.

Unfortunately, Cole made no mention of cricket. However, in Mandle's article there is a wealth of information that was easily accessible, gleaned from similar sources and could have been used productively by Cole. It is unfortunate that he did not discover them. However, it was not until the mid-1980s that any sophisticated framework was set up to examine the inter-action between sport and empire. This was achieved by Brian Stoddart in 1986.³ Cricket played a major role in this work, which attempted to develop a framework for examining sport in terms of cultural imperialism. His theory was an eclectic blend of various strands of thought, but it was encapsulated in the term 'cultural power', the weapon that was held in the hands of the British imperialists.⁴ This theory was derived from blending concepts of hegemony, originally formulated by Gramsci, with the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. Thus Stoddart said:

1 D.Cole, 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship. Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914', *Historical Studies*, Vol.14, (1971).

2 Cole, 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship', pp.524-5. Cole says: 'Not only is ethnocentrism universal, but it may be necessary. It is certainly useful in building or fostering group integration and solidarity (in-group adulation, out-group hate, and stereotyping are characteristic of group formation and consciousness, not least among classes). It is invariably the product of interaction between groups in which the vital interests, goals, and values of the group are in conflict'. (p.525).

3 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire'.

4 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', pp.3-8.

Sport may be envisaged as a powerful, informal institution creating shared beliefs and attitudes between rulers and ruled, but at the same time enhancing the social distance between the broad groups. This was particularly the case in the British Imperial setting where sport became a strong determinant of social relations, beginning from the domestic environment from which the games code was exported.¹

Cricket was obviously a major part of this construction as it was easily identifiable as the most British of games. Into this theory Stoddart allows resistance to the dominant cultural mode of the British. In the Trobriand Islands, Tonga and Samoa, cricket became modified and assimilated into a new adaptive form of the game,² while in Australia it might take a nationalist form as outlined in Mandle.³ At the same time it allowed people to succumb to the dominant mode of thought.

Stoddart was near to adopting the Cole line, not in terms of Cole's functionalism, perhaps, but in seeing that Australian Nationalism and imperial loyalty could co-exist side-by-side. His theory is cogent and interesting, but it is not water-tight. Without being a structuralist Stoddart sees everything in terms of opposition. Thus cricket becomes something that is imposed by a dominant culture and is resisted by those subjects of imperial power. This is hardly true, even in the Pacific region, and falls into the trap that a lot of theory based on ideas of hegemony falls into. Thus, the dominant power is seen as something that in reality is too dominant, while the subordinate class, or people, are regarded as too weak to resist the dominant power on their own terms, on an autonomous basis. Yet in Australia, where, as we have seen, nationalism co-existed with imperial loyalty, the possession of both these ideologies did not represent cultural domination. Indeed, they allowed Australians to think that they were equal or superior to the British. Furthermore, Stoddart suggests that the main engines of cultural dominance through sport were education and the church.⁴ It may well be that certain schools and churches imposed the cultural mores of the English bourgeoisie, but how many people were touched by this? What roles did voluntary organisations play in propagating hegemony? How was this opposition organised against it? In terms of cultural power Stoddart's framework for analysis is far too rigid and narrow. It seems more likely that there were two forms of ideology, one based around the white colonies that emphasised the cultural bond, but also encouraged the development of colonial nationalism; the other was an imperial ideology stressing the educative purpose of

1 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', p.4.

2 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', p.11.

3 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', p.17.

4 Stoddart, 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire', pp.6-7.

cricket alongside the civilizing mission, which was generally aimed at native races, and had an extremely modest success rate. Both sprang from the well of Anglo-Saxonism.¹

Class, race and Empire

Ideas about nationalism and race were connected with class, although sport and Empire were pervasive throughout society.² Nationalism, as a symbol of cohesion could be interpreted as part of dominant class ideology. Thus, things like national identity could serve as a similar symbol to the class conciliation of cricket. White believes that conceptions of national identity are produced or invented by the intelligentsia and are influenced by 'those groups in society who wield economic power'. Therefore national identities 'emerge to serve a social function'. They can act as a justification for powerful economic interests who are able to justify themselves in terms of serving the national interest. They can blur class and gender divisions. Nevertheless, the relationship between the ruling class and national identity is complex, and groups outside of the ruling class can develop ideas of national identity 'although they are unlikely to be dominant'. Equally, the ruling class is itself fragmented, containing powerful economic interests often competing with each other. National identity is therefore constantly 'fractured, questioned and redefined'.³ Into this framework is thrown ideas about race and gender. Thus cricket could serve the power of the ruling class by demonstrating that the Australian race was not deteriorating. The type was tested and the national identity as expressed through cricket was demonstrated to be a bold, manly son of the Australian soil.⁴ What White therefore offers is a brief glimpse of cricket that is more sophisticated than Mandle's nationalist views. Cricket boosted Australian nationalism, to be sure, but it also ^{boosted} the interests of the ruling class by presenting a cohesive image of what Australia and Australian males were like.

The value of White's work for this thesis is that it incorporates class into the framework of nationalist/cricket ideologies. It indicates that cricket could have a value

1 For a good critique of approaches to sport and imperialism, see R.Cashman, 'Cricket and Colonialism: Colonial Hegemony and Indigenous subversion?', in Mangan, *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, pp.259-71. In it he stresses the adaptive potential of cricket, preferring not to stress the role of indigenous or colonial élites. Cricket is therefore something that can be adapted by the culture that receives or appropriates it. Thus, while imperialists could export the game for the purpose of maintaining cultural power, the host culture could transform it as occurred in the Trobriands, and to a lesser extent in Trinidad (p.271).

2 J.McKenzie (ed.), *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1985), has demonstrated the pervasiveness of ideas about the Empire throughout society, as well as some of the strategies employed by the dominant class to create this culture.

3 R.White, *Inventing Australia. Images and Identity 1688-1980*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1981), pp.ix-x.

4 White, *Inventing Australia*, p.72.

for the dominant class in Britain and Australia. But once again we are left with a problem of the transmission of the values. Certainly the media was an important element in this, but then the images that it portrayed of Australian cricketers were never uniform, just as the images that it portrayed of Australians cannot be packaged together. Again, there is the question of how much cricketing nationalism served the ruling class. Nationalism had the definite potential to be radical and unpleasant, against the interests of the dominant class. As will be seen, the image of Australia and Australian cricketers was contested by different groups, sometimes by fragments of the dominant class, and sometimes by other classes. Cricket then could become an area of contestation for diverse interests within the class structure.

If this is true in Australia it is even more so in Britain where much of the subordinate class may have been relatively untouched by cricket and its ideology. Any national or racial ideas that were expressed through it had the negative potential to fall on deaf ears. As in Australia the links between cricket, nation and race were most strongly expressed by the dominant class. Consequently, despite the percolation of ideas about the nation and empire from the top of the social structure to the bottom, it is safer to locate this aspect of ideology within the dominant class.

Gender

The last major theme in cricket and sport history is the one that has been least written about. It is also the one that is least class specific, as well as only playing a background role in this thesis.¹ Gender, however, was one of the major determinants of Victorian sport, with a specific role moulded for women which was contested by some women, and a very few men, and accepted by the bulk. Equally, the repression of women was universal, although, as is always the case, some women were more oppressed than others. In the context of this study we are dealing with a sport which existed mainly in the sphere of male participation, although women did have a specific function at cricket matches as spectators. Equally, we are examining two specific élite institutions which were male only preserves for the whole of this period. The role of women is therefore unseen, although they undoubtedly would have conditioned the

¹ There has been, over the last few years, a development in the historiography. For example, Mangan and Park, *From Fair Sex to Feminism*; McCrone, *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of Women*. These works have generally concentrated upon middle-class women for it is they who made the most ground in terms of sport. This was a direct product of their class position which gave them educational opportunities and lifestyle which were commensurate with the development of sporting practices. However, it should be noted that this was by no means universal and the debate over whether it was safe for women to take strenuous exercises continued for many years (and in some instances to the present day with women's distance running being prescribed from the Olympic Games until the 1980s).

behaviour of the male agents who are examined. Likewise, the actions and attitudes of those agents would have partially been defined by their relationships with women, as well as their own sexuality. However, this thesis is not a collective psychobiography and the subconscious remains exactly that. What is important, however, is to recognise that contemporary conceptions of male and female behaviour, as well as ideologies connected with manliness and femininity were a complex and crucial part of sport.¹

III

Cricket, class and colonialism - a study of two élites

These then are the themes that underlie this examination of two different institutions which were 12,000 miles apart and yet shared many values. This thesis will elaborate the intersection of the ideology and functions of cricket with the actions of the two clubs. In England, it will look at the Marylebone and how it purposefully built its reputation as the premier cricket club in Britain and the Empire. It will show how the running of the club was a product of individuals who sat on the committee. It will demonstrate the significance of the club in the process of class formation, especially the relationship between it and emergent London Society and the Season. It will suggest that it was able to establish itself as a force in cricket and the Empire by the end of the nineteenth century by building contacts through committee members, and exploiting the invented tradition of the club which portrayed the institution as a pillar of society and the Empire.

In Australia the thesis will examine the Melbourne Cricket Club and its influence on the organisation of Australian cricket. As with the Marylebone it will use as its basis a detailed examination of the executive committee that controlled the club. It will show how the club attempted to import English cricketing practices and ideology in an effort to establish itself as the Australian Marylebone. It will also show how it too attempted to invent its own traditions and use them to consolidate its position both in Melburnian society and the organisational structure of Australian cricket. It will demonstrate that this had drastic repercussions, resulting in a destructive battle that changed the shape of the organisation of Australian cricket. But first, it is necessary to examine in detail the peculiar ideology of cricket, for it is this that the clubs sought to uphold, protect and exploit.

¹ Mangan and Walvin, *Manliness and Morality*, pp.1-5, demonstrate the significance of the ideology of manliness. Manliness developed as a neo-Spartan code, evolving out of Social Darwinism and muscular Christianity, while femininity 'demanded of women a docility, commitment to domesticity and subservience'. (p.4).

It is difficult to determine the way in which cricket's ethos evolved and nobody has satisfactorily ventured a reason for its development. Mangan has suggested that games were introduced into the public schools for a variety of reasons including boy control, health development and socialization into the school and into the class system as a whole. He believes that it was this that led to the carrying of games, with their concomitant ethos, into society at large, leading to the formalisation of rules and the mass organisation of sport.¹ This explanation was also utilised, to an extent, by Dunning and Sheard in their study of the development of rugby football and the 'civilizing process'.² However, both they and Mangan leave unexplained how cricket developed its ethic into such a ritualized and formalized code. Cricket, even more than rugby, was the symbol of the whole athletic creed and as such it was the backbone of what has been called the games ethic.³ But where did this creed originate? Implicit in the arguments of Mangan, Dunning and Sheard, and others, is that the ethic was developed in the public schools. However, it is arguable that cricket became a major pastime in the public schools because it already possessed the ingredients of 'fair play' etc., which were to make it so palatable to the tastes of public schoolboys and teachers. A proto-ethos of cricket is far older than the Arnoldian revolution.

In fact, Cricket's code evolved over centuries, although it found its apotheosis in the Victorian and Edwardian eras. By then it had combined muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism to create an ideology which embraced concepts of manliness, Anglo-Saxonism, class-conciliation and pastoral idealism. This chapter traces the evolution of cricket's ethic from the eighteenth century to the outbreak of the First World War.

I The proto-ethic

Various strands of the cricket ethic are traceable back to the eighteenth century and the era of the Great Matches. In 1744 a game of Cricket was played between teams representing Kent and All-England. It was a closely fought contest with Kent winning by the narrow margin of one wicket. The game was immortalised by James Love in his *Cricket: an Heroic Poem*,⁴ written in the same year. The first line is the most famous -

1 Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School*, *im passim*.

2 Dunning and Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players*, *im passim*.

3 Mangan, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism*, *im passim*, assumes the existence of such an ethic.

4 F.S.Ashley-Cooper (ed.), *James Love: Cricket an Heroic Poem*, (C.H.Richards, Nottingham 1922).

'Hail Cricket! glorious, manly, British game,'¹ and the poem continues in the same vein:

O parent, Britain! minion of renown
Whose far-extended Fame all nations own;
Of sloth-promoting sports, forewarn'd beware!
...While the firm limb, and strong brac'd nerve are thine
Scorn eunuch sports, to manlier games incline;
Feed on the joys that health and vigour give;
Where freedom reigns, 'tis worth the while to live
Nurs'd on thy plains, first Cricket learnt to please,
And taught thy sons to flight inglorious ease...²

Here are seen three of the factors that were commonly espoused during the late nineteenth century as being the hallmarks and benefits of cricket. The first is the belief that cricket was 'manly'. The concept of 'manliness' has been discussed in some detail by Mangan and Garthorne-Hardy in their respective books on public schools. Mangan suggests that it was 'the resuscitation of Elizabethan aspiration rather than an Evangelical innovation', while also stating that it did have strong elements of evangelicalism and Social Darwinism.³ Garthorne-Hardy believes that 'between 1850 and 1890 games gradually took over entirely the nebulous areas of "character", "manliness", and "tone"'.⁴ The overall impression that they give is that 'manliness' was, in the main, a quintessentially Victorian creation that arose in the public schools from the playing of games.⁵ However, if we take Love as our example then we see that cricket had been imbued with the spirit of manliness well before the Victorian age. Undoubtedly the Victorians injected into manliness the social and sexual mores of their time, so much so that Percival, a headmaster at Clifton, insisted that boys playing football should wear trousers fastened below the knees lest they should become sexually excited at the sight of bare flesh.⁶ But this should not lead us to believe that manliness was wholly a Victorian creation.

Secondly, Love mentions Cricket's uniquely British quality. This as will be seen below, was a very important aspect of its appeal during the Victorian and Edwardian period, particularly in the age of xenophobic imperialism and 'splendid isolation'. By 1914, at the outbreak of war with Germany, cricket became a symbol obsessively used to contrast British benevolence with German aggression. One cricket journalist wrote:

1 Ashley-Cooper (ed.), *James Love: Cricket an Heroic Poem*, p.10.

2 Ashley-Cooper (ed.), *James Love: Cricket an Heroic Poem*, pp.10, 13.

3 Mangan, *Athleticism*, pp.135-6.

4 Garthorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon*, (Penguin, London, 1979), p.161.

5 Mangan, *Athleticism*, p.135; J.Garthorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon*, , pp.160-70.

6 Garthorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon*, p.85.

'In England during the troubled time we play cricket. In Germany they mob Englishmen. Ours is surely the better way'.¹ This sentiment is not that far removed from Love.

Finally, Love suggests that cricket had an educational purpose as it taught the sons of Britain 'to fight inglorious ease'. That this was recognized before the Victorian era cannot be denied. Only four years after the young Queen came to the throne, the commanders of the army ordered that 'where the opportunity occurs a cricket ground and a fives court shall be formed in the vicinity of the different barracks throughout the kingdom, and that the respective games shall be encouraged by the colonel of every regiment'.² The implication is that the army believed that cricket had a purpose beyond that of being a mere game and that it had some practical use, although whether it was seen as reinforcing cross-rank regimental loyalties and/or being conducive to health among troops is not clear. Surely it was the same impulse that led the public schools to adopt cricket and other games after 1850. That Cricket already combined all three of these elements prior to the age of Victoria is further suggested by the original introduction to John Nyren's *Young Cricketer's Tutor*, which was written by Charles Cowden Clarke in the early 1830s:

Of all the English Athletic Games, none perhaps presents so fine a scope for bringing into full and constant play the qualities both of mind and body as that of cricket. A man who is essentially stupid will not make a fine cricketer; neither will he who is not essentially active. He must be active in all his faculties... He must be cool-tempered, and, in the best sense of the term MANLY; For he must be able to endure fatigue, and make light of pain.³

Furthermore, cricket was an essentially pastoral game and an impression of pastoral harmony or rustic fraternity was suggested by the image of rich and poor meeting with equality on the cricket field. Thus the proto-ethic bore the hallmarks of class-conciliation. Indeed, in the mid-eighteenth century this was one of the areas where cricket came in for a deal of criticism. Thus in *The Gentleman's Magazine* a correspondent declares himself disgusted that 'honest Crispin' should play with 'a member of Parliament'.⁴ Evidence of social mixing, at around this time, was the basis of the historian G.M.Trevelyan's contention that 'if the [French] noblesse had been capable of playing cricket with their peasants, their chateaux would never have been

1 *Cricket World*, Vol.1, (1914), p.426 .

2 P.F.Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, (London and Counties Press Association, London 1912), p.484.

3 J.Nyren, *The Young Cricketer's Tutor*, (Davis-Poynter Ltd., Bristol 1974), p.1.

4 *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol.13, (1743), pp.485-486.

burnt'.¹ Therefore, cricket was at this time one of the areas where in theory, and in theory alone, men could meet with social distinctions cast aside. Cricket is presented as wearing a face of fairness where all behaved like and were gentlemen. It was akin to what Lord Harris was to call the 'republic of the playground' over a century later.²

Above all, cricket was already a highly potent symbol and as early as 1756 it was seen as something which could symbolise the progress and conflicts of life, and even the mortality of man. In this year a poem was published which describes a game played at Merchant Taylors school. Cricket is portrayed as 'an emblem of many colour'd life' and as a metaphor for the struggle of faction at court and in politics. The final lines are the most interesting:

In private life, like *single handed* play'rs,
We get less *notches*, but we meet with less cares.
Full many a lusty effort, which at court
Would fix the doubtful issue of the sport,
Wide of the mark, or impotent to rise,
Ruins the rash, and disappoints the wise.
Yet all in Public, and in private, strive
To keep the ball of action still alive,
And just to all, when each his ground has run,
Death *Tips the wicket*, and the game is done.³

This poem contains the seeds of the idea of the game of life, which was proselytized by headmasters, teachers, preachers and authors in the 1860-1914 period, no more notably than by E.W.Hornung, the creator of Raffles, who said 'I believe with all my heart and soul that in this splendidly difficult game of life it is the cheap and easy triumph which will be written in water on the score-sheet'.³

Tracing how the ethic developed is a matter of briefly examining the social dynamics of eighteenth century society. Crucial to this is the input of the upper classes. Significantly, there are certain aspects of cricket's ethic that are held in common with the ideals of 'gentlemanly capitalism', as well as more general ideologies developed by the landed élite of Britain. For example, it has been noted that the 'cult of the amateur' had its origins in aristocratic power, which emphasised hereditary inheritance of land and power, deferential and paternal relationships with lower classes. It was these factors which enabled the heirs of the feudal tradition to live a life of relative independence holding in contempt such things as wealth creation and profit motive. It

1 Quoted in John Bright-Holmes, *The Joy of Cricket*, (Unwin, London 1985), p.255.

2 *Cricket*, Vol.4 (1885), p.454.

3 *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol.26 (1756), p.489. The words in italics are archaic cricket terms.

3 Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School*, p.194.

also enabled them to live a life of conspicuous consumption.¹ Cain and Hopkins note that this pre-capitalist heritage merged with incomes derived from commercial agriculture, and so the landed class controlled the means of authority and also became the most successful element within emergent capitalism. This in turn produced the ethic of 'gentlemanly capitalism' which emphasised certain attributes of status and life-style. 'The more an occupation or a source of income allowed for a life-style which was similar to that of the landed classes, the higher the prestige it carried and the greater the power it conferred'. Thus the gentleman capitalist knew that he had to keep his distance from the 'everyday and demeaning world of work', because 'full-time involvement in industry was incompatible with the gentlemanly ideal'. Equally, the gentleman capitalists operated under a code of rules of conduct that emphasised qualities that were to become associated with 'fair play' and the amateur spirit. It also meant that professions in the the business community, like banking and insurance, operated under a similar code, and were therefore more socially acceptable than early industrialists and other capitalists. Within this group conspicuous consumption became a critical component of life-style.²

This has implications for the development of cricket's ethic for there are similarities that are of crucial importance. Firstly, because gambling was an integral part of eighteenth century cricket it may well have been necessary to adhere to a strict code of rules to prevent serious disputes from occurring. It was only natural that as it was the gentlemen that were laying down the large sums their code of conduct for business and life should be incorporated into the game of cricket. Secondly, cricket, in itself could become a means of conspicuous consumption. Playing the game seriously meant that time and money had to be laid aside and this could only be done by those that played for a living, or those that had the financial resources to enable them to lead a life of leisure. In these circumstances it is obvious that the relationship between the two groups would be conditioned by class. The leisured men could impose their ideals of deference and gentlemanly behaviour upon the game. The professionals could develop a trade. And so in part the amateur ethos evolved. As in capitalism at large, the ideologies of the landed élite and gentlemanly capitalism merged to create the code by which cricket was played, embracing feudal ideals, pastoral idylls and emergent business. The proto-ethos of cricket was very much a product of its time.

1 P.J.Cain and A.G.Hopkins, 'Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Expansion Overseas I. The Old Colonial System, 1688-1850', *Economic History Review*, Vol.39, No.4 (1986), p.504.

2 Cain and Hopkins, 'Gentlemanly Capitalism I. ', pp.504-9.

II

The ethic in the Victorian and Edwardian eras

It was later that the ethic was consolidated. It took ideological developments in the Victorian era to create it in its full form. Once again class was crucial in the evolution, with mid-Victorian attitudes about race, religion, class, community and Empire contributing to the final mould. This enabled cricket to become perhaps the most ideological of western sports with its clearly defined code, encapsulated in the phrase 'playing the game', operating outside the written laws of the game on an informal but commonly upheld basis. During the late years of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth centuries cricket came to possess a quasi-religious and spiritual purpose, elevating it to a position almost akin to Sumo wrestling in Japan, where the wrestlers take part simultaneously in a religious ceremony and a sporting contest. Thus cricket became its own morality play and was recognized as the game of God's own Englishmen.

Manliness, muscular Christianity and fair play

Citing Norman Vance's definition of 'manliness' Mangan and Walvin say it embraces the 'qualities of physical courage, chivalric ideals, virtuous fortitude with additional connotations of military and patriotic virtue'.¹ They also believe that the concept underwent a change from the beginning of the century. Originally, it had stood for earnestness, selflessness and integrity. But later it was to become associated with neo-Spartan virility, perhaps under the influence of Social Darwinism. From the mid-century it was adopted by the public schools and was diffused throughout the English speaking world.²

The literary apotheosis of manliness was Tom Brown, the hero of Thomas Hughes' public school classic *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. Nowhere was the ideal more clearly articulated than in the transformation of Tom from the young barbarian to the Christian gentleman who prayed at night in his dormitory in front of the other boys and played at day with a straight bat. This tale of the production of a Christian gentleman elevated cricket to a high-point of spirituality and worthiness. The lessons that cricket taught were lessons for the life of a gentleman. Significantly, the climax of the book is set on the playing fields of the school. It is Tom's last cricket match, and he is the

1 Mangan and Walvin, *Manliness and Morality*, p.1.

2 Mangan and Walvin, *Manliness and Morality*, pp.1-5. What Mangan and Walvin seem to do, however, is to isolate 'manliness' from other strains of nineteenth century thought. Indeed, it appears that 'manliness' was part and parcel of a whole package that involved concepts as wide-ranging as pre-Raphaelitism, neo-Romaniticism, Social Darwinism and 'fair play'. Neither did it altogether lose its earlier meaning, rather it was transformed by the blend of muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism.

captain of the school team which happens to be playing the Marylebone CC. He is seated with his friend Arthur and a young classics master. They are watching the game and discussing the significance of cricket. The classics master says:

"I'm beginning to understand the game scientifically. What a noble game it is too!"

"Isn't it? but it's more than a game. It's an institution," said Tom.

"Yes," said Arthur, "the birthright of British boys old and young, as *habeas corpus* and trial by jury are of British men."

"The discipline and reliance on one another which it teaches is so valuable, I think," went on the master, "it ought to be such an unselfish game. It merges the individual in the eleven; he doesn't play that he may win, but that his side may."¹

This is not far removed from Love's 'Hail Cricket! glorious manly British game' and it provides the essence of manliness, although in this instance the Christian element is implicit rather than explicit.

Following Hughes, cricket was used as a potent religious symbol particularly for the young and one could even be forgiven for thinking that cricket gave the Church of England some of its flavour towards the end of the last century. Perhaps the most famous instance of cricket adopting a religious posture is the egregious *Baxter's Second Innings*,² which has been described as 'the public school boy's *Pilgrims Progress*'.³ It is a mini-epic of muscular Christianity featuring a young boy who has to defend his wicket against the Demon Bowler Temptation. Its use of cliché is superb, but it makes no bones about the way to develop a moral life:

Did you ever think what makes a good man? No? Well, its the same thing that makes a boy a good oar, Or a good shot, or a good anything; it's practice. A boy who never goes to the gymnasium or uses the dumb-bells gets no muscle in his arm. A boy who never pushes against Temptation gets no muscle in his character. Temptation is simply dumb-bells. It is really a splendid thing.⁴

Here is a world of moral absolutes where the game of life is played by upright and manly chaps fighting against the twin evils of sex and foreigners. If you play with a straight bat in cricket and in life you will be rewarded in the 'pavilion of heaven'.⁵ Every good or evil deed is marked down on 'your scoring sheet. Your Character'.⁶

1 T.Hughes, *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, (Puffin, London 1986. Orig.Pub.1857), p.271.

2 Prof.H.Drummond, *Baxter's Second Innings*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1892).

3 Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School*, p.204.

4 Drummond, *Baxter's Second Innings*, p.51.

5 I believe that among others who used this particular expression was E.W.Hornung. The style is easily parodied, a fine recent example being in Terry Gilliam's film *Brazil*, which was scripted by Tom
6 Drummond, *Baxter's Second Innings*, p. 51 .

Baxter's Second Innings is one outstanding example of a much wider and more pervasive literary genre which permeated the world of the upper and upper-middle class boys during the late nineteenth century through sermons, articles, poems and books. Mangan in *Athleticism* and his second book *The Games Ethic and Imperialism* highlights the teachings and preachings of various people during this era.¹ But it is also instructive to examine one or two other examples of this genre. Norman Gale, who was at other times concerned with matters secular, wrote a poem called *The Dark Bowler*, very much in the sub-*Baxter's Second Innings* mould. The Dark Bowler is Gale's equivalent to Temptation and is portrayed as a deadly effective cricketer. On the other hand, the batsman, who is the narrator, seems to be cheerfully buckling beneath this onslaught ;

That nearly passed me! That again
Miraculously missed the bails!
Too good a sportsman to complain,
He never flags, he never stales.
Small wonder if his varied skill
So fine a harvest daily reaps,
For how he marries wit and will!
And what a deadly length he keeps!²

Meanwhile, Gerald Duff, author of *At the Nets...Or Lessons from cricket*, presents a more staid picture. He had neither the flair of a Gale nor the humour of a Drummond:

Clean bowled and by a miserable full-pitch too! Yes, it is a bad case,
my dear fellow; but if there be any comfort possible in such an
experience...you are by no means the only luckless wight that has
suffered such ignominy.³

However his message is similar: guard against temptation and deliver yourself from evil with a straight bat. Cricket is morality and vice-versa. It provides a code by which to conduct your future life and it is also a response to a moral imperative.

You will be expected to deny yourself in many ways. Remember to
leave wide margins in all your accounts. Much of your leisure time it
will be necessary to devote to study and equipment of yourself for
your work; and your weekend recreations will need to fulfil the

Stoppard, always an astute observer of English pretensions. At one point he refers to someone who has been killed as having 'upped stumps and left for the pavilion'.

1 Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian Public School*, ch.8, pp.179-206; *The Games Ethic*, ch.1, pp.21-43.

2 N.Gale, *More Cricket Songs*, (Methuen, London 1905), pp.17-18.

3 G.Duff, *At the Nets...or Lessons from Cricket*, (J.W.Butcher, London 1910), p.9.

literal meaning of the word - the creation of more energy for attacking the duties of the next week. And never forget that *health is a moral duty*.¹

In the context of famous cricketers, Lord Harris was as much a proselytiser as any of the aforementioned. He undertook many lectures and sermons, using his fame as a cricketer for social and religious purposes. On one occasion in a sermon tinged with religious references

[He]...pointed out the great advantages which cricket and football had over a selfish game like golf, and proceeded to show to his audience that in life, as in cricket, they ought to play for their side.²

Muscular Christianity was the rarified and religious aspect of 'playing the game'. Its secular equivalent could be no less spiritual and could have as wide an application. Cricket's emphasis upon fair play led to any action which was morally unsound being labelled 'not cricket'. But 'playing the game' also emphasised the importance of being British, of playing for your side, and of leading the Empire. Thus cricket was seen as an intrinsically English game with a wider Imperial purpose.

As a manly game, it instructed its young men in the art of self-sacrifice and the importance of leadership. This found its apotheosis in Henry Newbolt's poem *Vitae Lampada*:

There's a breathless hush in the close tonight -
Ten to make and the match to win -
A bumping pitch and a blinding light,
An hour to play and the last man in,
And it's not for the sake of a ribboned coat,
Or the selfish hope of a season's fame,
But his Captain's hand on his shoulder smote -
'Play up! play up! and play the game!'

The sand of the desert is sodden red, -
Red with the wreck of a square that broke;
The Gatling's jammed and the colonel dead,
And the regiment blind with the dust and smoke.
The river of death has brimmed its banks
And England's far and honour a name,
But the voice of a schoolboy rallies the ranks:
'Play up! play up! and play the game!'

The equation is simple. Cricket is a manly, self-sacrificing game which produces strength of character and body. Teach a boy cricket and you instil in him important

¹ Duff, *At the Nets*, p.58.

² *Cricket*, Vol.18 (1889), p.445.

principles for later life. As Andrew Lang said in 1893: 'There is more teaching in the playground than in schoolrooms, and a lesson better worth learning very often'.¹ It is therefore not surprising that the public schools should adopt cricket and other games and turn them into a vehicle of education. And lest anyone should doubt that these games had a profound effect upon the ideology of Victorian and Edwardian Britain, consider the reaction to Kipling's poem *The Islanders* when it was published in 1902. His description of the 'flannelled fools at the wicket' and the 'muddied oafs at the goal' caused an outcry. Kipling was criticising the commanders and officers of the British army and their ineptitude during the Boer war. Much of the blame he laid firmly at the door of the public schools and their bias towards games. Norman Gale was one of those who vigorously rejected Kipling's criticisms, placing the blame elsewhere. He felt that it was not a case of cricket failing Englishmen, rather of Englishmen failing cricket:

As sloppiness our sport bereaves
Of what was once a glorious zest,
And Female men are thick as thieves,
With croquet, ping-pong, and the rest,
Prophetic eyes discern the shame
Shall humble England in the dust;
And in their graves our sires shall flame
With scorn to know the nation's game
Cat's-cradle; cricket gone to rust,
My lads.²

It would be an exaggeration to say that Gale was a good poet, or even a mediocre one. But he was popular, and his indignation at Kipling is apparent throughout the poem. Kipling had nipped a raw and open nerve. But *The Islanders* failed to change anything. Cricket and other games remained a dominant feature of public school education and a perceived part of English culture, so much so that one correspondent to *Cricket* magazine wrote in 1913 that:

Cricket has helped so largely to mould the English character that the name has passed into the language of the people as a kind of colloquial summary of those qualities upon which the Anglo-Saxon race prides itself... England would be a far greater nation than she is today if our ministers, consuls, and merchants had all had a course of training on the cricket fields of England (why was my dear old

¹ Bright-Holmes (ed.), *The Joy of Cricket*, p.253.

² N.Gale, *More Cricket Songs*, p.19. The use of the phrase 'female men' undoubtedly has homosexual connotations, whether Gale meant it or not. Manhood is equated with manly games, while games where there is no physical danger are associated with unnatural instincts, although why Gale had it in for croquet is anyone's guess.

friend, Alfred Lyttelton, the most beloved and respected man in the House of Commons?).¹

Cricket, race and nation

Cricket became a key component of Anglo-Saxonism, the belief in English ethnocentricity. The prevailing mood of Social Darwinism gave cricket further credence as it was upheld as a pillar of Englishness, a bulwark against racial degeneration. The doctrines of Darwin were applied to society by Herbert Spencer and the 'survival of the fittest' came to mean racial survival. This survival was to be ensured by physical as well as mental fitness. Of course, cricket had a role to play in both areas.² That the game was connected with racial characteristics can be seen from as early a date as 1851:

the cricketer wants wits down to his fingers ends. As to physical qualifications, we require not only the volatile spirits of the Irishman *Rampant*, nor the Scotchman *Couchant*, but we want the English combination of the two; though, with good generalship, cricket is a game for Britons generally: the three nations would mix not better in a regiment than an eleven, especially if the Hibernian were trained in London, and taught to enjoy something better than what has been termed his supreme felicity, "otium cum dig-gin-taties".³

To this was added the statement that 'the game is essentially Anglo-Saxon. Foreigners have rarely, very rarely, imitated us'.⁴ And so from the mid-Victorian era the game of cricket was established as something quintessentially Anglo-Saxon, containing an Englishness that some believed even made it inaccessible to other Britons.⁵ It was regarded as embodying the national characteristics, which led one observer to say 'when you find a man completely out of sympathy with cricket, you will generally find some other rather un-English trait'. Equally, another commentator said:

Into the causes of this peculiar institution not merely failing to flourish, but steadfastly declining to take the smallest root in soils unshadowed by the British flag or its successors, it is needless to enter here. Few of those who understand the game at all, and have any knowledge of national character, will fail to recognise, if they cannot define, the inaptitude of aught but the Saxon element for such a sport.⁶

1 *Cricket*, Vol.2 (2nd series) (1913), p.612. The writer signed himself 'J.H.Farmer(Old Harrovian)'.

2 see C.Bolt, *Victorian Attitudes to Race*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1971).

3 J.Pycroft, *The Cricket Field*, (Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman, London 1851), p.14.

4 Pycroft, *The Cricket Field*, p.16.

5 Although the definition of Anglo-Saxon and Briton was frequently nebulous with no set or irreducible boundary.

6 Anon., 'Cricket', in A.Trollope (ed.), *British Sports and Pastimes*, (Virtue, London 1868), p.291.

It was believed by some that the French were unsuited to playing the game, as one commentator said 'it is true that into the tense and palpitating eighty minutes of rugby their nervous genius finds fuller scope than in cricket's leisurely progress'.¹ Nevertheless, towards the end of the century it was recognised that people from an 'inferior' race could play cricket well and benefit from its moral lessons. Thus C.B.Fry said 'I have seen three non-white examples in cricket: Indian, Malay, and West Indian Negroes. All three were distinctly quicker with a cricket bat than any white man I have ever seen'. Nevertheless, he reckoned that Englishmen were 'superior in the will-made endurance we call pluck'.² Of course, when England was defeated at its national game by the Australians there was some despair and shaking of the head. *The Times* reminisced about this with a few years hindsight:

When the Australians were carrying all before them six years ago, we began to wonder darkly whether England was losing in the match against time; and there were those who hinted that we must begin to give way to a race of larger and hardier men. But since those days of defeat the mother-country has asserted her authority: the Australians are still formidable, but they are no longer regarded as invincible.³

The importance of sport and cricket as a moral bulwark to the English nation was seen in the title of a self-improvement pamphlet by Eustace Miles, entitled *Let's Play the Game - or the Anglo-Saxon Sportsmanlike Spirit*. As he said about the 'Anglo-Saxon sportsman': 'he's the eternal player'.⁴ What Miles was trying to demonstrate was that games were one of the purest forms of life, and that to live in the manner of true and pure Anglo-Saxon it was necessary to approach life in the spirit of a sportsman:

With what comparison shall we suggest that right action for an Anglo-Saxon or anyone else on any given occasion? Let others honestly choose the comparison that really helps them most to "sense" and then carry out the right action. For my own part, I find, after trying many other phrases like "spiritual" and "perfect", that the phrase "let's play the game" has corresponding to it in my mind the very best, and purest, and strongest, and sanest memories...It is said that all's fair in love and war; and one might imagine that a similar code of immorality often held in politics, business, and other spheres. In games, thank goodness, it does not hold. Heaven grant

1 E.V.Lucas, 'A Frenchman In the Pavilion', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.1, no.1 (1904), p.66. It is true that Lucas believed that there was some chance that the French would take up cricket.

2 C.B.Fry, *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.1, no.1 (1904), p.100.

3 *Times*, (24 July 1884), p.9.

4 E.Miles, *Let's Play the Game - or the Anglo-Saxon Sportsmanlike Spirit*, (Gilbert Pitman, London 1904), p.26.

that it never may, so that we can have at least one manly Anglo-Saxon phrase to fall back on.¹

Cricket and other sports had this potential to be utilised as a metaphor because they were believed to represent what was good in Anglo-Saxon culture. Thus they were enabled to become a symbol of race and nation.

The significance of cricket's ethos went further than this, for it also had the potential to be utilised as a subconscious expression of the commonly held fear concerning the alienation and unhealthiness of the city. Again, theories about race were in the centre of this, for the late nineteenth century had seen a growing cry about the degradation of the cities, which some eugenicist scientists believed would lead to the degeneration of the race in the urban environment:

The country people are of large bony framework, with well developed muscles, broad shoulders; with florid complexions, fair-hair, and light-coloured eyes. They are the mixed descendants of the Anglo-Saxon and the Dane...Yet look at the denizens of large towns! You see them small in bone, light in muscle, short in stature; with chest measurements small in all directions. They constitute, indeed, another race...What, then, is the change which has gone on, and produced this transformation in the physique? It is retroversion. Town residence is changing the Anglo-Dane into the small, dark, Celtic type, whom the Norseman dispossessed. The modification is reversion to an earlier, lowlier, ethnic form. Just as physique is changed, so is the psychique [sic.]. There is the same precocity, the same emotional temperament. The town-dweller is a retrocedent Celto-Iberian.²

To some the solution to these problems was more sport through the provision of playing fields. Thus Lord Brabazon argued that without the provision of open spaces and greater physical education 'the inhabitants of our towns must degenerate in health'. Provision of these facilities would lead to a reduction in infant mortality, better physical and mental development, and a decrease in crime, drunkenness and immorality.³ Others felt that sports in general, and cricket in particular, had prevented degeneration:

The great leisure of to-day, compared with that which was granted in past days to those who pulled the labouring oar in life, has converted the employés, who, from overwork and constant late

1 Miles, *Let's Play the Game*, pp.x-xii.

2 J.Milner Fothergill, M.D., 'The Effects of Town Life upon the Human Body', *National Review*, Vol.10 (1887-88), pp.166-7.

3 Lord Brabazon, 'Open Spaces and Physical Education', *National Review*, Vol.8 (1886-87), pp.183-90

hours in cities and large towns, degenerated into effeminate Englishmen,...into fine manly young fellows of pluck and sinew.¹

Nevertheless despite the foundation of the London Playing Fields Committee in the early 1890s these fears persisted and were further compounded by the disasters of the Boer war. C.B.Fry, writing in 1905-6, commented on this and the recent defeat of the cream of British rugby by a New Zealand team. While believing that defeat in sport was not necessarily an indication of racial degeneration he did say:

a town-bred can never compete in physique with a country bred people. We at home are chiefly town-bred; they in New Zealand are chiefly country -bred...The bush-men from Australia made better Irregulars in South Africa than our townee volunteers. But what we should like to know is, would the Australians, had they been townees like our men, have made as good Irregulars as our townees actually proved?²

His answer to this problem was not dissimilar to that of Brabazon, believing that there should be an increase in the leisure facilities, and an improved use of leisure time. In a more forward way he also advocated an improved diet.

Cricket, then, by encapsulating the best of the Anglo-Saxon values was part and parcel of these beliefs about the maintenance of racial purity and the dangers of degeneration. It was a totem of Englishness. Nowhere was this better summed up than by the professional cricketer A.E.Knight:

Cricket is, in truth, a "British game". Strain as we may into dusk and twilight for the hazy origins of its primitive forms, the true origin of modern cricket is with Harris and his comrades [at Hambledon]. We ourselves have been termed "naturalised aliens", bidden to look afar for the fatherland of our race. The national game, however, is at least our own. Not more truly did the English channel make a Nelson, than the green fields of home nurture our cricket. In these great gardens of the south she grew, by leafy lanes, and on sheep-trimmed downs across white-cliffed edges sweeps the Sea-scented south-west wind.³

Cricket and Empire

Cricket's perceived importance to the Empire and to Imperial relations was merely a logical extension of cricket's connections with ideologies of race and education. The bias towards games and those who played them influenced the selection of colonial

1 F.Gale, *Modern English Sports: Their Use and Their Abuse*, (Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London 1885), p.viii.

2 C.B.Fry, 'Straight Talk', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.4, (1905-06), pp.209-10.

3 A.E.Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, (Methuen, London 1906), pp.22-3.

officers and administrators. This was particularly true of the post-1900 period with the development of the Sudan Political Service and the arrival of Sir Ralph Furse in the Colonial Office.¹ Conversely it is possible that the appeal of the Empire as a place for service was often considerably more for the ardent games enthusiast and devotee of the games ethic. After all, the self-sacrifice that team games were supposed to instil was not a million miles removed from the qualities that Kipling himself espoused for his ideal and neglected officials. These were the boys who were encouraged to 'bridge the ford' by 'playing the game'. But more importantly games, and especially cricket, were perceived to be an important part of the cultural bond of empire. It was this impulse that led John Astley-Cooper to propose, in 1891, the establishment of a periodic festival to celebrate the achievements of the British race. The festival was to include Industrial, cultural and athletic displays and the purpose was to strengthen the imperial bond.²

However the ideological importance of cricket to the Empire was more complex than this. There were two interrelated ideologies at work. The first is a white colonial ideology of cricket, the second is a more general imperialistic rationale. Both are the product of a belief in the supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon and are therefore the product of Social Darwinism. The 'white colonial' ideology was upheld in Britain and the colonies of Australia, South Africa, Canada, New Zealand, etc. It involved a self-belief in the civilization of the Anglo-Saxon and was therefore part of the ideological make-up of those who regarded themselves as descendants of the English. Particularly in England there was a feeling that cricket had the power to cement the cultural bond between Britain and the empire. Thus Eustace Miles wrote:

One of the most urgent topics of the day must be, "what is the connection, at the present moment, between ourselves and our colonies: what has bound us together, what binds us together now, and what will bind us in the future?" For we may be sure that what has bound us together in the past will be likely to bind us together in the future.

*Among the chief bonds of union are points of resemblance. We resemble the Australian colonists, for example in our appearance, our dress, our traditions, our customs, and so on; but among the strongest points of similarity are our forms of sport and Athletics...Wherever we see these forms of Athletics, to some extent we feel ourselves at home.*³

1 Mangan, *The Games Ethic*, ch.3. Sir Ralph Furse, *Aucuparius. Recollections of a recruiting officer*, (Oxford University Press, London 1962). Furse did not arrive in the colonial office until 1910 - his influence was mainly felt after the First World War.

2 K. Moore, 'Sport, Politics and Imperialism. The Evolution of the Concept of British Empire Games from 1891-1930', in Benning (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference of the BSSH*, p.47.

3 E. Miles, 'Sport and Athletics, and the British Empire', in *The British Empire Series - British Empire League*, Vol.5, (Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, London 1902), p. 497.

This type of sentiment was expressed in Australia at regular intervals, especially when either a touring team visited Britain from Australia, or vice-versa. Thus in 1878, Reynolds wrote of the first Australian XI

the visit to England of a strong team of Australian cricketers was calculated to bring the colonies into prominent notice, and prove to the residents of the old world what a proud position the Greater Britain is destined to hold in all athletic sports.¹

Similarly, W.C.Biddle, secretary of the Melbourne CC, welcomed George Parr's All-England XI in 1864 by saying:

Although many thousands of miles separate us from the dear old country, the love of the national game of cricket is as ardent amongst us as in any other part of the world...we hope that when you leave us, it will be with the conviction that you have spent a few months amongst your fellow-countrymen, and that on your return to the old country, you will be able to congratulate yourselves upon having had such a pleasant and profitable trip...²

However, as Mandle has noted, these expressions of devotion, loyalty and kinship, were partially based upon a desire to show that Australia had not been contaminated by convictism, or the un-English climate, and that the Anglo-Saxon race was flourishing in its new Britannia.³ Once again the ideology of cricket was connected to ideals of race. As one journalist commented, cricket offered the opportunity to prevent Australians from degenerating racially in the same way as the Americans:

One of the most healthy features in the colonisation of Australia is the ardent attachment which the colonists continue to manifest for the athletic games and field sports of old England, the neglect of which has been so enervating an influence upon the race of native-born Americans, more particularly in the older states. As long as this is the case there is no fear of Australians degenerating into a bar frequenting, tobacco chewing people...⁴

Once Australia had proved that it was a match for England at its own national sport Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity as manifested through cricket was turned to a more clear nationalism which, to some extent, undermined the ideology of imperial unity. This

1 'Argus' (P.E.Reynolds), *The Australian Cricketers' Tour through Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain*, (J.W.McKenzie, Epsom 1980 - facsimile reprint of original, published in Sydney 1878), p. 1.

2 *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle* (B.L.V.), (19 Dec. 1863). There are no page numbers in this periodical.

3 Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', pp 233-7.

4 B.L.V., (23 Nov. 1861).



occurred after 1876 and was expressed with varying degrees of strength. At an extreme it was the boasting of 'Corn Bob':

Anthony Trollope
Says we can wallop
The whole of creation at "blowing",
It's well in a way,
But then he don't say
We blow about nothing worth showing...

We grow bone and muscle
To stand a stout tussle;
We've licked "All England" at cricket;
How well we can row
'Twere needless to show,
Since Britain knocked under to Trickett.¹

But more normally it was a mixture of Imperial unity, racial solidarity and a mild Australian nationalism, as expressed by 'Wattle Blossom' in 1882 following the victory over England at the Oval which led to the legend of the Ashes:

The friendly relations of old are resumed,
And all the unpleasantness deeply entombed;
For England is proud of that tie that endears-
Is proud of the sons of the old pioneers.

But where is that time-honored nation of yore,
Whose cricketing fame like her Mountains was hoar
Ere Austral arose from her ocean-clad sleep,
And burst into life from the depths of the deep.

Aye where? They are conquered, their pride is laid low,
Like a stately ship tost [sic.] on the deep to and fro;
But the victors are scions of sons of the land,
And Britain is proud of Australia's brave stand.²

The mixture of nationalism and racial solidarity can be seen almost 50 years later being expressed by M.A.Noble. His vision of cricket was more nationalistic than that of 'Wattle Blossom', but it could not deny the Englishness of cricket, or Greater Britain's place within the Empire of cricket:

Nothing that ever came out of England has had such an influence on
character and nation-building as this wonderful game of ours.

¹ Originally published in the *Australasian* in 1877, this was reprinted in A.Shaw, A.W.Pullin ('Old Ebor'), *Alfred Shaw Cricketer - His Career and Reminiscences*, (Cassell, London 1902), p.58. Trickett was a famous Australian sculler.

² 'Wattle Blossom', 'The Australian XI', in H.F.Boyle, D.Scott, *The Australian Cricketers' Guide*, 1883-84, (Boyle and Scott, Melbourne 1884), p.183.

Nothing that happens in any British community in normal times possesses the same quality of bringing out enthusiasm, national partisanship and downright interest as a Test match. The cricket instinct seems to be born in the flesh and bred in the bone of every one of us. In Australia it is as virile as ever it was in England. There is no game that brings men so close together on a high level as cricket, no game that is quite so conducive to the initiation of healthy discussion, the free exchange of opinions, and the declarations of candid views.¹

Thus while the 'white colonial' ideology of cricket cannot be said to have produced monolithic views about nation and race, it is possible to see that Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity managed to dwell comfortably besides colonial nationalism.

However, there was a greater imperial ideology of cricket which was utilised for the purpose of 'civilising' native races. This was most commonly propagated in India, Africa and the Pacific, although there were instances of its use in Australia on the Aborigines.² While this thesis does not set out to explore the nature and effect of this imperial ideology of cricket, it is worth looking at elements of it. As an ideology it was propagated by administrators, members of the armed forces and missionaries. They attempted to impose cricket and its concomitant ideology upon the 'colonized' group with varying degrees of success. This was the praxis of the belief in the civilizing mission of cricket.

As has been seen sport in general, and cricket and rugby in particular, were represented as English institutions which were a force for good within Anglo-Saxon society. On the other hand, men like Lord Harris sincerely believed that cricket had a role to play in the civilisation of India, and he actively attempted to carry this programme out while he was Governor of Bombay:

I really do not know a sight more creditable to British capacity for administration than that of a cricket match on a parade ground at Bombay...From ten to twenty thousand spectators preserve for themselves an orderly ring, watching with the most intense interest an English game played between Englishmen and the natives in a thoroughly good, sporting, gentlemanly spirit...All this you see in the buildings [surrounding the ground], and in the crowds a respect for authority and for order, and a growing love for a manly healthy occupation. And all this has been produced by *Pax Britannica*; for remember this, that India had not for hundreds of years known such peace as England has secured for her.³

1 M.A.Noble, *The Game's the Thing*, (Cassell, London 1926), p.1.

2 See for the case of the Aborigines, D.Mulvaney, R.Harcourt, *Cricket Walkabout: The Australian Aboriginal Cricketers on Tour, 1867-68*, (Macmillan, London 1988).

3 Lord Harris, 'Bombay', in *The British Empire Series*, Vol.1, pp.70-1.

And so *Pax Britannica* was linked with cricket, and the natives were improved by coming into contact with the ideology.

Nowhere was the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon nature of cricket and its imperial purpose explained better than in the writing of E.G.Guggisberg. Guggisberg was Canadian and Jewish; an administrator in West Africa at the turn of the century, who later founded the famous Achimota College. The following quote stands as a metaphor for the imperial ideology. First, three men from different classes are seen harmoniously united upon the cricket field in West Africa. But then Guggisberg demonstrates that cricket had a missionary purpose outside the confines of the white colonial ideology:

Three stumps are pitched in a small patch of ground, innocent of grass, rolled hard and fairly smooth by the roller...That roller...is worth examining - it is an extempore one, roughly cast of cement, with a rusty piece of waterpipe as an axle...A poor looking thing as rollers go, but a fine witness to the keenness on cricket of the maker- that sunburned man in the dungaree breeches...who is standing at the wicket, padless and gloveless, and with a much scarred, much bound bat in his hand. He is a "Sheffield Blade"...and learnt his cricket after his day's toil in the great engineering works where he was employed. One of the two individuals bowling to him - the short man clad in a similar kit- is an old soldier and the overseer of the mine gangs. The other - the possessor of real flannelled cricket trousers, you will notice - was once a by-no-means inconspicuous figure in a great public school eleven a few years ago...A curious trio drawn together by the love of the game...they are cricket missionaries these three, propagating the game, for look at the half-dozen other players from the native clerk...to the brown, more or less clad, natives fielding with the greatest of keenness.¹

The spirit of imperial cricket was diverse in its extremes, but it was deliberately compacted into this piece of writing. Interestingly Guggisberg put his money where his mouth was when he founded Achimota. The college subscribed heavily to the games ethic.²

However, the imperial ideology of cricket had the potential to become distorted in a way that the white colonial ideology did not. There were varying reactions to this attempt at cultural imperialism that ranged from acceptance or bewilderment to rejection.

1 Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, pp.330-1. There is an even more extraordinary description of cricket in West Africa by Guggisberg in the book that he wrote with his wife; see D.Moore and F.G.Guggisberg, *We Two in West Africa*, (Heinemann, London 1909), pp.67-8. However, it was too long to cite from effectively.

2 see F.G.Guggisberg and A.G.Fraser (principal of Achimota College), *The Future of the Negro*, (Student Christian Movement, London 1924), p.85.

At its most extreme the ideology was taken and turned on its head. Cricket was taken and then adapted, until it contained little of its original meanings. This was at its most extreme in the Pacific, where a range of Melanesian and Polynesian cultures adapted and transformed the game, which was generally introduced to them by missionaries whose sole aim was social control. The most celebrated case of this occurred in the Trobriand Islands off Papua New Guinea; however, much the same occurred in Samoa. Games between whole tribes had the potential to last a week, and the following description demonstrates how the imperial ideology of cricket was turned into a method of negotiation and exchange between different Samoan groups. One tribe would visit another and lavish ceremonies would be laid on to welcome them. As far as the game was concerned, the result was dictated by the customs of hospitality. It was necessary for the visitors to win, but at the same time it was important that the margin of victory was narrow. The game was accompanied by feasting, celebration and exchange of gifts. As the bemused English writer commented:

About three hours' play produced some 250 runs for the loss of some twenty wickets, and an adjournment was made for the second meal of the day. This was on the usual lavish scale of Samoan entertainment, and the Villagers really impoverished themselves in their efforts to "do" their visitors well. It was this aspect of the game, and the fact that the case often occurred of chiefs mortgaging their lands to pay for the expenses incident on these cricket matches, which caused a paternal Government to limit the duration of the games, and to restrict the stake played for...and when the natives gave up working, and took to playing week-long matches over months of time, the Government found it necessary to intervene.¹

Cricket was therefore re-invented to suit the structure of the colonized people's society.²

And thus, while cricket's ethos was based upon a presumption of the racial superiority of the Anglo-Saxon, other cultures had the ability on the one hand to accept or reject this ideology, or on the other to adapt it and create new meanings for the game. With the white colonial societies, which had a claim to membership of the Anglo-Saxon

1 A.W.Mahaffy, in Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, pp. 394-5. Mahaffy was the acting High Commissioner of Samoa. Despite the 'corruption' of cricket he still believed that there was the potential to utilise the imperial ideology: 'Clean sport is the greatest civilizing influence in the world' (p.398).

2 I am grateful for Dr.M.Macintyre, Dept. of Social Anthropology, Latrobe University, for pointing out that the famous film of Trobriand Cricket was in fact highly dramatised. However, this does not detract from the fact that the Trobriand Islanders took cricket and made of it something new. Undoubtedly, cultural adaptation was very important in the negotiation between rulers and ruled. In the case of cricket in the South Pacific the outcome of such negotiation was outright victory to the colonised.

race, the reaction was determined by their implicit understanding of the ideology. In Australia the ethos was generally accepted, and it was a commonplace to use cricket as a metaphor showing racial solidarity with the English. But even here the ethics of cricket could be adapted and new cultural formations created. The part that cricket played in the building of a general nationalism in Australia that, to a greater or lesser extent, supported the idea of Australian ethnocentricity should not be ignored. Nevertheless there are other considerations to be made about the ideology of cricket, specifically in relation to class.

Cricket, class and the rural idyll

Cricket was believed to be the game of peasant and peer,¹ a game where the classes could mix in harmony on the cricket field. As such, in England, cricket was idealised as a game which could bring conciliation between men of different social backgrounds. It was for this reason that village cricket was idealised as the ultimate form of the game, for not only did it present a rural image of a green and pleasant England that by the turn of the century was predominantly urban, but also reproduced what was seen as the ideal class relations that existed in the pastoral dream. Take this description of village cricket written in 1907:

Village cricket - it is not pretentious...Yet there is a peculiar fascination about it which is different from that of either county or club cricket, though just as full of charm....To begin with, there are its beautiful environments - and what could fail to be luring, if surrounded by miles of stretching fields losing themselves in blue-misted distance?...Then there is the splendid mixed composition of the teams. The squire, the curate, the schoolmaster, the grocer, the blacksmith, the doctor, the farmers, labourers, the groom and the butler from the hall, and probably in the holidays a few public schoolboys whose homes are in the district. This variety is found in most village teams, rendering them splendid mediums for the spread of Kropotkin ideals. But above all, what makes real village cricket so delightful is its humour, for which it is unequalled by any other class of cricket.²

Despite the fact that this is obviously fictionalised by a man who hardly, if ever, played village cricket, it is an interesting account. He has managed to include virtually every male member of the entire rural social structure and then dumped them in a harmonious cricket team in which there is fellowship, although everybody keeps to their place. It is

1 Line from a poem, Anon. 'The Fine Old English Game' (c.1830), quoted in C.Box, *The English Game of Cricket*, (*The Field*, London 1877), p.438.

2 'The Gaffer', 'Village Cricket', *Cricketer and Hockey Player*, (1907) cited in D.Rayvern Allen, *Cricket's Silver Linings, 1864-1914*, (Collins, London 1987), p.362.

also worth noting his reference to Kropotkin ideals, which is his way of saying that true socialism is friendship harmony and class-conciliation. It was the same feelings that led C.B.Fry to say that 'you can have County cricket a gross parody of cricket, and village cricket genuine and true. You cannot have a real officer without the heart of an officer, and you cannot have real cricket without the heart of cricket'.¹

The idealisation of rural cricket was definitely part of ^{this} reaction against urbanisation, to be sure, but the most striking part of the idyll is this insistence on class-conciliation. It was the belief that classes could mix on the cricket field that produced a situation where amateur and professional could play side-by-side in first-class cricket. What this meant was that unlike Rugby or Association Football, the highest levels were integrated. But the integration was highly structured within the confines of a deferential master-servant relationship. Amateurs were the leaders, the dashing officers of cricket, while the professionals were the foot-soldiers of the game. Consequently, Victorian cricket revealed the way in which the dominant class viewed the social structure. One is presented with an idealised picture of class relations and how the dominant class believed the subordinate class should behave.

The cricket authorities of England produced what can only be described as social apartheid. Amateurs and professionals were separated physically as well as socially. The professionals were made to change in separate accommodation, they frequently entered the playing arena through different gates, they were made to bowl to members of the clubs that they represented. When on tour with their county or country all too often they stayed in different hotels. They were expected to serve their masters compliantly and efficiently. Their were positive and negative incentives to ensure that they kept to their place. They might be awarded talent money for their performance on the cricket field or, under Hawke's system of discipline, they might incur a black mark which represented a negative gain. Good behaviour would also ensure that they received a benefit after 10 years of service. Bad behaviour might prevent access to this important source of income.

Attitudes to professionals were derived from dominant-class beliefs about the nature of society. These attitudes were displayed in the press of the day. In general, it was a positive image that was presented. Many followed the lead of Lord's Harris and Hawke. Harris was very much a paternalist who believed that professionals should be treated well. He felt that conditions of employment should be improved, and that mobility between counties should be facilitated. He hoped in this way to create respectable professionals. As such he was merely translating his political beliefs about

¹ C.B.Fry, 'Sanity: and County Cricket', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.21, (1914), p.181.

the working class into practice, for Harris was a member and supporter of the Primrose League and therefore believed in 'democratic' conservatism.¹ Hawke held politically similar beliefs and also styled himself a friend of the professional. Indeed, he claimed that he had 'done more good than anyone to raise the standard and self-respect of the splendid paid section of first-class cricketers...'.² And yet, Hawke could be brutal in his discipline, hounding out of the game Bobby Peel for allegedly being drunk and urinating on the pitch, a charge that Sissons has discovered is unfounded.³ He also, in one famous instance, prevented two Yorkshire stars from making a lucrative tour to Australia, for the simple reason that he did not like the idea of them going with an unofficial team.⁴

The difference between amateur and professional is best seen in the way that the two were written about in the contemporary press. Interviews and player profiles were quite different when describing amateurs and professionals. The style of the amateurs play would be described, as well as his educational background. However, no character references were made, the assumption being that everybody knew that the person in question was a gentleman, so no further comment was necessary. Professionals were different. Thus Bobby Peel was described as 'always civil and obliging'. Tom Emmett was instilled with 'animal spirits',⁵ and Bobby Abel was a 'cheery little cricketer known familiarly...as The Guv'nor'.⁶ Meanwhile, amateur T.C.O'Brien was born in Dublin, educated at Downside and went to Oxford.⁷ As Home Gordon and Leveson-Gower said 'many of these admirable cricketers are not only capital fellows, but men of considerable education and refinement, whose opinion is worth having and whose good word is an honour to possess'.⁸

However, for all the charm and education of professionals it was believed that professionals could not possibly make good captains because they were deemed to lack the necessary qualities of leadership. Gordon's remarks above must be slightly

1 R.Sissons, *The Players. A Social History of the Professional Cricketer*, (Heinemann, London 1988), pp.86-91

2 Lord Hawke, (ghosted by Home Gordon), *Recollections and Reminiscences*, (Williams and Norgate, London 1924), p.82.

3 Sissons, *The Players*, pp.180-2.

4 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.209.

5 Anon., *Cricket Chat: Gleamings from "Cricket" During 1883-84*, (Cricket Office, London 1884), pp.52; 60.

6 Anon., *Cricket Chat: Gleamings from "Cricket" During 1884-85*, (Cricket Office, London 1885), p.27.

7 Anon., *Cricket Chat: Gleamings from "Cricket" During 1883-4*, p.9. Note the exception to the rules on amateurs were the Grace brothers and the Australians. Both groups were, of course, exceptional.

8 H.Gordon and H.D.G.Leveson-Gower, 'The Status of Amateurs in Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.14, (1902), p.326.

tempered by his comments that 'professionals have enjoyed a curious notoriety for being bad captains, and the Player's team has often been badly handled'.¹ Likewise, it was believed that there was a specific difference in the way that amateur and professionals played their cricket. Again, the prolific Gordon said:

A characteristic of cricket is that the methods of professionals are more laborious than those of amateurs. Brockwell, Trott, Braund, and some others form exceptions, but the general rule may be safely laid down that the gentlemen play more attractive cricket than the paid division.²

And so the professional was treated as a member of the working class, and was, in many ways, no better than a wage-slave, and was often treated as such.³ This was determined by the social structure in general, while the rural idyll and the ideology of class-conciliation were themselves by-products of the same structure.

In this sense there was a specific difference between professionalism in Britain and Australia. Whereas in Britain the role of the professional was extremely important in Australia there were fewer professionals and their position was constantly questioned. In Victoria, where the Melbourne CC kept a small cadre of professional cricketers, this division was particularly evident. In the late 1850s there was an attempt to introduce a match between gentlemen and players. This brought forth two specific responses. The first was humorous ridicule:

Oh, Listen now while I relate, the funniest tale in Life, sirs,
Of two-and-twenty fine young men engaged in friendly strife, sirs;
Eleven were nobbs, eleven were snobs, but I can't quite define, sirs-
The limits of the opposing sides, or which eleven was mine, sirs.

And now a moral I must draw, in good old story fashion,
First hoping that it won't put any person in a passion;
When next the Gentlemen do wish their disgrace away to rub, sirs,
They should pick their men from far and wide, and never mind the club, sirs.⁴

The other was an altogether different form of criticism, which stressed that new countries should have new views about class and cricket:

We cannot allow any remarks on this match to appear without recording our opinion on the want of taste displayed in drawing the above invidious distinction in the two elevens selected. It may be

1 H.Gordon, 'Cricket Captains', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.10, (1900), p.636.

2 H.Gordon, 'Cricket Characteristics', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.21, (1914), p.26.

3 Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, pp.254-6.

4 *B.L.V.*, (18 April 1857).

considered unobjectionable in England, but in these colonies such notions ought not to be tolerated, as they tend to prevent that general equality amongst cricketers which the nature of the game is calculated to engender.¹

The criticism was not so much that class distinctions should not exist, but more that in reality the division between amateur and professional was subversive of the ideology of cricket. Therefore, what was being stressed here was that the ethic of class-conciliation should stand and the division between amateur and professional should not be tolerated because of this. As will be seen in Part 3 of this thesis, the Melbourne CC itself, although keeping professional cricketers, was split between adherence to this particular interpretation of the ethic and the traditional English one.

Matters became complicated with the advent of the Australian XI, which was run along the lines of a joint-stock company. Consequently cricketers from Australia who were nominally amateurs could make large sums of money from playing the game. This created controversy in both Britain and Australia. The British saw the Australians as sinners against the spirit of the game, while Australians were split between this attitude and one which said that the division between amateur and professional should not be upheld in Australia. All that can be said here, in anticipation of dealing with this question in more detail, is that attitudes in Australia were not as monolithic as in Britain.

Gender

The ideology of cricket intersected with conceptions of gender. As noted earlier cricket was regarded as a manly game, in other words it instilled bravery and chivalry into the participants. Cricket therefore was generally not regarded as a suitable game for women, although this attitude was not universal, especially among those women who established the first girls public schools. However, a traditional attitude was displayed by this piece of advice to a girl correspondent in *The Captain*:

Cricket is not a girls game, and so I do not feel disposed to give you any advice about how to bowl over-arm. I don't believe in much gymnasium work for girl's games. Nature never intended that a woman's body should be wrenched about and made muscular.²

Within the traditional ideology of cricket the one and only place for women to be involved was as spectators of the game. In this role, particularly with the development of the Society cricket matches at Lord's, they were generally cast as the butt of men's

¹ W.Fairfax, *The Cricketers' Guide for Australasia*, (W.Fairfax, Melbourne 1858), p.33.

² The Old Fag (pseud.), 'Answers to Correspondents', *The Captain*, Vol.17 (1907), p.190

jokes, which were usually designed to indicate the ignorance of women. Thus R.D.Walker said about the Eton v. Harrow matches of the past

ladies thought that one Eton and one Harrow boy occupied opposing wickets, that the top scoring-board marked the Eton runs and the lower the Harrow, and that the two sedate looking gentlemen in long white coats were the respective head masters of the two schools...¹

This sentiment was expressed more drolly by *Punch*:

Miss Nelly sits cool in the cricketer's booth,
And watches the game, about which, in good sooth,
Her curious interest ne'er ceases.

She now wants to know of the flannel clad youth,
However, the wickets can well be kept smooth,
When she hears they are always
*In creases.*²

Thus the male nature of the game was sustained by an exclusive quasi-freemasonry where women were rarely allowed to intrude. Of course, by the end of the century there were exceptions to this, and there was one woman who frequently contributed to *Badminton Magazine* in a column entitled 'Cricket from the Ladies' tent'. But even she had to admit that the playing of cricket should be left to men:

Why do men consider cricket as their exclusive property, and believe no girl ever really understood or truly cared for the finest of the games? Men, of course, have always been, and will continue to be the practical cricketers, and no one wishes it otherwise; it is essentially a man's game, as it needs strength and pluck, and endurance, and many other hardy qualities. But many women have quite as keen a love for it as the cricketers themselves.³

Likewise a male commentator on the subject admitted that although many of the women who attended the society games were there just for fashion's sake, that there were some who not only knew the players but also the colours they were wearing (i.e., who belonged to each team and what teams were playing), and the names of the positions of the players on the field.⁴

A similar process occurred in Australia. Cashman, in *'Ave A Go Yer Mug!*, identifies the stereotypes which grew up around the tradition of women attending cricket matches. He recognises two specific images of women in this context which

¹ R.D.Walker, 'Eton and Harrow Match', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.5 (1897), p.392.

² *Punch*, 1 Aug. (1896), p.49.

³ E.Hallam, 'Cricket from the Ladies Tent', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.6, (1898), p.628.

⁴ W.J.Ford, 'Thoughts on Spectators', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.8, (1899), pp.529-30.

were frequently described in the press. The first was the portrayal of the knowledgeable woman, who knew the names of all the players and something of cricket technique, while the second was the fashionable woman, who came to the cricket to be seen wearing the latest designs, promenading behind the Ladies Pavilion, or if at Adelaide, actually on the cricket field itself (just like at Lord's).¹ Both these images represent male constructions of women framed within a masculine ideology which subordinated the role of women in society to their needs. But, it is interesting to note the replication of the social customs of the British bourgeoisie, as well as the replication of the two stereotypes of women and cricket which had been established in Britain since cricket became fashionable.

Ideology undermined

It is an axiom of cricket that standards of behaviour and play are not as good as they were in the past. There seems to be a maudlin streak in the game which recognises that cricket obeys the natural law that all things decay. It should therefore be no surprise that in this period, which is now identified as the golden age of cricket, contemporary observers felt that standards were declining and that the ethos of the game was being undermined. Not only were there frequent complaints about cricket becoming a business, the decline of leg-play, the vast numbers of draws and the usage of pads to block the ball,² but also there were serious charges of the whole ethos being undermined by the development of shamateurism. At the heart of this were many of the top amateurs who received over-generous expenses, meaningless jobs within the county organisations and, if the criticisms of some are believed, much more besides.

The problem was recognised by many of the top cricket writers of the day, although some like C.B.Fry denied that shamateurism existed.³ Even some amateur cricketers, including Marylebone CC committee member H.D.G.Leveson Gower, concurred with accusations of shamateurism.⁴ Some of the criticisms were extremely

¹ R.Cashman, 'Ave A Go Yer Mug!', p.63.

² See for example, Hon.R.H.Lyttelton, 'Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.3 (1896), pp.230-6; 'Rapier', 'Notes by Rapier', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.3 (1896), p.500-2; Hon. & Rev. E.Lyttelton, 'More about the Cricket Problem', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.9, (1900), pp.647-52; Sir A.Lyttelton, 'Cricket Reform', *National Review*, Vol.34, (1899-1900), pp.230-5. It might appear that these criticisms were all coming from one family, as the Lyttelton's were brothers. It is, however worth considering the position of the Lytteltons, whose words definitely carried a large amount of weight. E.Lyttelton happened to be headmaster of Eton, while A.Lyttelton was a barrister of note and a senior Tory politician. They were all influential within the Marylebone CC. For non-Lyttelton criticism of the state of cricket see C.B.Fry, 'The Morals of County Cricket', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.16, (1911-12), pp.123-8.

³ Anon., 'Gentlemen v. Players', *Punch*, (12 Sept. 1896), p.123.

⁴ Gordon and Leveson Gower, 'The Status of Amateurs in Cricket', pp.326-9.

harsh by the standards of the day, with Hutchinson's 'Parlous Condition of Cricket' leading the way. Cricket he believed was 'a perfect institution' that had gone wayward. Apart from the game becoming a business there were too few amateurs actually playing, with many of those who were termed amateur being professionals in all but name. He believed that the amateur was getting the equivalent of broken-time payments, or even receiving a regular salary 'for other services, which he does not perform and which he never thought of fulfilling'. He also accused some county clubs of making arrangements with local firms, asking them to employ the amateur, with the club paying the salary if the firm allowed him away for all the games he was required to play. The blame for this lay in the 'custom' of designating amateurs, as well as a system that was prepared to countenance such behaviour.¹ Other critics included the professional cricketer A.E.Knight who believed that the distinction between amateur and professional had 'long since lost its validity...[and] the distinction...rests, in the main, upon social grounds'. By this he meant that the difference was one of class position rather than financial payment from cricket.² Major Phillip Trevor, who managed the 1907 Marylebone CC tour to Australia, agreed with Knight both as to the problem and the solution, which was the drastic one of abolishing the distinction altogether and establishing cricket as a profession in ^areal occupational sense.³ Significantly, both of these writers believed that the amateur spirit was essential to the game, and that amateurism *per se* was the ideal. So the criticism was essentially not against the ideology of the game but against the fact that they saw it being undermined. In every sense it was a truly conservative stance.

It was this conservatism that led to the almost universal mixture of criticism and sympathy aimed at the players who had gone on strike before the Oval test match of 1896. A week before the beginning of the match five players including George Lohmann, William Gunn and Tom Hayward wrote to the Surrey committee, who were organising the game and paying the wages and expenses, asking for a rise in match fees from £10 to £20. This was declined and three of the five backed down, but Lohmann and Gunn remained firm, and were therefore excluded. Nevertheless, it was recognised by all that there was a hidden agenda, part of which was over the expenses paid to the English amateurs, while the rest related to the amount of money that the Australian players earned from the game while retaining their amateur status. Both of these aspects were recognised by the press. Consequently, *The Times* accused the players of being

1 H.G.Hutchinson, 'Parlous Condition of Cricket', *National Review*, Vol.35, (1900), pp. 791-5.

2 A.E.Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, pp.228-9.

3 Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, pp.302-7; Major P.C.W.Trevor, *The Problems with Cricket*, (Sampson, Low, and Marston, London 1907), pp.207-9.

'clumsy', believing that their claim was justified but also saying that 'loyalty to the Surrey club and patriotism for English cricket should have been a sufficient incentive to the players to have practised self-denial a while longer'.¹ The same issue noted that the Surrey committee had had to answer accusations about expenses paid to amateurs. Notably the two names mentioned were Grace and Stoddart.² The secretary of the Surrey club released a statement saying that Grace was being given no more than £10, but nothing was said of Stoddart, who mysteriously withdrew from the game at the last minute with an injury. *The Athletic News* was even more sympathetic, bringing into focus the issues of amateur expenses and Australian dividends:

£20 is quite little enough for a match of this description, for it must be remembered that a man must be at the head of his profession to enable him to get a place in the team, and his abilities deserve recognition. It is all very well to talk about the honour of being in an English Eleven, but if a man is making a living at cricket he ought to be amply remunerated, and £10 is not sufficient. This is all the more glaring when one comes to consider what the Australians make out of it, not to mention the amounts paid to amateurs under the elastic head of "expenses". But Lohmann and co. took their stand at the wrong time - they were about six weeks too late, for previous to the first test match was the time to make their complaints to the M.C.C.³

The Australians threw the shamateur issue into sharp relief as they were regarded as men who came from a lower social background than English amateurs. It was not so much a matter of them getting well paid for the time they spent playing cricket, but that they were regarded as occupying a similar class position to professional cricketers in England. As one journalist, 'C.H.L.', commented on the arrival of the 1896 Australian XI:

As regards the class of the men socially, it is much the same as that of most of the previous Australian elevens - good, straightforward fellows of the rough and ready sort, but the majority of whom in this country would undoubtedly go into the players' room rather than the pavilion. Not that there is any disgrace in being a pro, for there are no men more respected in the world of sport than such as Lohmann, Briggs, Peel...and a host of others, whom gentlemen go out of their way to honour.⁴

1 *The Times*, (11 Aug. 1896), p.11.

2 *The Times*, (11 Aug. 1896), p.9.

3 *The Athletic News and Cyclists' Journal*, (10 Aug. 1896), p.1. The writer then went on to say that he felt that cricketers were underpaid.

4 *The Athletic News and Cyclists' Journal*, (27 Apr. 1896), p.5. It is interesting to note that all three of these professionals were involved in the strike.

Australian cricketers were even supposed to play in the dour fashion that was supposed to be the style of the professionals, with Arthur Budd saying:

They are slow and studiously correct in their cricket, sometimes wearisomely so. They hit at nothing but loose balls, but the fact remains that they are terribly difficult to get rid of, and that you never know when you have done with them.¹

It was ironic then that it was the English system of shamateurism that protected the Australians, for if the English authorities had attempted to curb the money-making activities of the visitors, they would have had to take the drastic step of addressing the abuses of shamateurism that were sitting on their own doorstep. This was recognised by the ever-perceptive Knight who said that until 'we have a real and vital principle underlying our own amateurism - in lieu of grotesque semblances fostered by an amiable laxity and shuffling expediency - can we fairly rebuke Australian practices'.²

III Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to see inside the Victorian cricketer's mind. It has sought to reveal how the ideology of cricket worked. It is not enough to criticise the Victorians for their hypocrisy in cricket. In reality it is necessary to understand how the ideology actually functioned. As can be seen, on one level cricket was an educative tool which built upon foundations laid in the eighteenth century using the building blocks of muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism. From this aspect it was propagated through the public schools and it percolated, to a very limited extent, down the social structure, although it was never a successful hegemonic strategy due to the weakness of the transmitters. On another level it intersected with ideologies of imperialism and colonialism being seen, at one and the same time, as an effective part of Anglo-Saxon culture, while serving as part of a more general 'civilizing mission'. There were, however, problems with both this and the class-conciliatory nature of the game, which were recognised by contemporary observers. The Australians and the shamateurs seemed to undermine the ethic, while some observers in the antipodes actually believed that the amateur/professional dichotomy undermined the true ethos of the game. Nevertheless, cricket was still said to be the most English of games, and it preserved its ideology and hierarchical nature for many years into the future.

This thesis is essentially about what two specific institutions, one in London the other in Melbourne, made of the ideology. In other words it aims to demonstrate how

¹ *The Athletic News and Cyclists' Journal*, (3 Aug. 1896), p.3.

² Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, p.230.

they utilised cricket and its ideology for their own ends. As such it posits that cricket was a significant part of the wider bourgeois society in both countries. It also suggests that these institutions became part of the continuous process of class-formation. By analysing cricket's ideology, part of the mind of the dominant class of the Victorian and Edwardian eras is revealed. By examining the actions and attitudes of the Marylebone and Melbourne CCs the ideology in action is demonstrated. But more than this, the importance of cricket to different sections of society is clarified.

This is the first scholarly examination of two institutions that had enormous symbolic power in their respective societies and beyond. They also possessed wealth and prestige that generated for members status that helped them in some ways to shape the game of cricket. However, this does not claim to be a history of cricket for it concentrates on the limited area of first-class cricket. It is also limited, in the main, to the actions of a single class, although it is impossible to avoid the relationship between the classes in cricket. The reasons for these limitations are implicit in what has already been written. Overall cricket was more popular in this particular class. However, this, and the denial of an hegemonic function for cricket, does not imply that cricket was only popular within the dominant class. Histories of professionalism have demonstrated that this was not the case.¹ Certain communities in certain geographic areas located outside the boundaries of the dominant class produced many first-class cricketers. There was a long tradition of cricket being played by people from the lower classes.² But more writing has been dedicated to the issue of professionalism and the actions of professionals than has been directed towards their ultimate masters. Nevertheless, despite this participation, it is the case that cricket was a more important social and cultural formation to the dominant class as an entirety, than it was to the subordinate, or working class in its entirety; just as it is the case that Football (Association) was more important to the subordinate class than it was to the dominant class. However, this thesis is not a call for a change in direction. There is a place for the study of both groups, particularly a study that demonstrates the dynamics between the two. It is hoped that this examination of two institutions that were important in the

1 Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game* ; Sissons, *The Players* ; Mandle, 'The Professional Cricketer in England in the Nineteenth Century'; L.Allison, 'Batsman and Bowler: The Key Relation of Victorian England', *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.7, no.2, (1980) - makes this point.

2 For example, two groups are outstanding examples of this. Firstly, the framework-knitters in Nottinghamshire which produced the great bowler Alfred Shaw. Secondly, villages like Lascelles Hall, which sent a string of fine cricketers to play for Yorkshire. Of course, it was the professionals that revolutionised the game of cricket, a fact that has been frequently forgotten, although not by the scholars cited above.

development and playing of cricket in England and Victoria will help any such studies in the future.

PART 2

See Marylebone Cricket Club: Club, Society and Empire,
1840-1914

CHAPTER 3. THE COMMITTEE OF THE MARYLEBONE CC AND VICTORIAN SOCIETY

I

The Invention of Tradition: Commentators and Historians on the Marylebone CC

It is hard for anyone, let alone a non-cricketer, to understand quite what the Marylebone CC is, for it is that most paradoxical thing - a Great British Institution. As such it is on a par with institutions like the House of Lords, and is therefore something of a sacred cow. Those who wish to examine it with a degree of objectivity, circumspection or even criticism, do so at their own peril for they risk raising the ire of numerous *Daily Telegraph* readers from the wilds of Tunbridge Wells. Actually to define what the Marylebone CC once was is a harder task still. In the 1990s it appears to be an almost semi-mythical body with its traditions and history shrouded in the mists of antiquity, having shed all its powers, save that of guardian of the laws, to the Test and County Cricket Board, the National Cricket Association, the Cricket Council and the International Cricket Conference.¹ The illusion of power still remains, however, reinforced by the quiet grandeur of Lord's with its stately red-brick pavilion. There is a solemn, some might say 'breathless', hush about the place which makes the remark of Sir Robert Menzies that Lord's was the 'cathedral of cricket' absolutely comprehensible. Yet in the early years of this century it was more than a mere cathedral, it was the Vatican, seen as the ultimate authority of the game, controlling and arbitrating for Britain and its empire.

In 1987 the Marylebone CC celebrated its bicentenary and to mark the occasion the ex-Glamorgan and England captain Tony Lewis published an official history of the club in a glossy table-top edition. On the back of the dust-jacket, underneath a slightly abstract painting of the famous weather-vane of Old Father Time, in bold black print is the simple motif **'THE STORY OF THE MCC IS THE HISTORY OF CRICKET'**. This is hyperbolic and is akin to saying that the story of the English monarchy is the history of its people. Lewis's book is establishment history, it is cricket history from the top, with the MCC as the élite. But cricket is an establishment game, and one can see that this striking statement had cricketers, fans, commentators, writers and pundits of one sort or another, rhythmically nodding their heads in agreement: indeed, 'the story of the MCC is the history of cricket'. Nevertheless, Lewis's book is a moderate representation of one of two particular views of the Marylebone CC, which are polar opposites. On the one hand are those commentators who see the club as being the 'fountainhead' of cricket, while on the other side are

¹ A.Lewis, *Double Century. The Story of MCC and Cricket*. (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1987), p.11.

those who see the club as having little importance to the history cricket before the 1890s. Cricket writers tend to fall into the former category, with Lewis's recent work being a well-researched example of this school. Social historians on the other hand fall into the other camp.

The mythological reputation of the Marylebone CC, on which the work of Lewis and others draws, has little basis in fact prior to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless this reputation rests on a sturdy bed-rock of writing dating much further back into the nineteenth century. This has emphasised that the club was all-powerful, autocratic, the true ruler of the game of cricket from its foundation in 1787. This has a grain of truth in it, as the Marylebone CC has undoubtedly been the maker and reformer of the laws of cricket from a very early date. Equally, during the first two decades of the nineteenth century the club, under the autocratic eye of Lord Frederick Beauclerk became, an arbiter in disputes over the laws, and was recognised as such by many cricket clubs in the British Isles. However, the laying down of the law did not make it the central organisation, the absolute controller, of many subsequent peoples' perception. This was only to be achieved during the second part of the nineteenth century, and even then was restricted, in the main, to first-class cricket.

It was at the beginning of this period, in the 1860s, that the myth of the Marylebone CC was becoming established, and as such was invented and best propagated by the club itself and its most ardent supporters. This was particularly the case in the 1860s when the club was under threat from the combined forces of the Surrey CCC and the professionals. For example, at the AGM of 1864, the president, Lord Suffield, made the following statement, that was to become a commonplace sentiment, showing that he and others regarded the club as something of a paper-tiger, but which ought to develop a roar:

[It was] his very humble opinion that the Marylebone Cricket Club should hold a position in the cricketing world similar to that which was maintained by the Jockey Club in the racing community, and as a first step to that he proposed that they should secure themselves permanent head-quarters at Lord's cricket ground, where laws could be regularly made and carried out, and where all the questions relating to the game might be properly inquired into and settled for the interests and undeniable advantage of all cricketing classes in the United Kingdom.¹

At the same meeting a much more forceful statement was made by Lord Charles Russell, who mapped out what he saw as the future of the club by way of describing its historic significance:

¹ *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, (16 Apr. 1864), np.

He had not the least doubt that the game might degenerate, that "swiping and hurling" might be the order of the day, in fact that the noble game of cricket might become in the course of time anything but what it was when played by their fathers. He had seen it coming gradually to this for a length of time past, and therefore it was that he would like to see the MCC established upon a firm basis, that it might become a court of appeal to decide all matters concerned with the game, and to regulate without fear of contradiction the mode in which it should be played.¹

The secretary of the club was equally specific about the future of the club and its historic past, and as he commented at the meeting:

It [MCC] had from the earliest period of its existence comprised among its members all the leading gentleman cricketers of the day, and had never failed to support or to bring before the public the best professional talent. The laws of cricket had been originally compiled, and accepted by the country as from the best exponents of the game. To maintain that position it was of great importance that the club should have individual control over its own resources.²

The club was undoubtedly an old and aristocratic institution, but it was from this date that its real importance to the history of the game stems. It is therefore not surprising that it was in these years that the mythology of the club was created and then expanded. From the 1860s the club was recognised as the 'fountainhead' of cricket.³ The Rev. James Pycroft, the epitome of the nineteenth century cricket reactionary, confirmed this belief in his influential writing, and in the process vastly overstated the case. For this very reason, in his work it is possible to see the active development of the myth, especially when he stated that the club was 'the great central power, the very balance-wheel of the world-wide machinery of cricket'.⁴

Various cricket writers and commentators in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries adopted and developed this theme, many of them actually being members of the club. One of the most important of these was the cricket writer and journalist,

¹ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 4 April 1864.

² *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 4 April 1864.

³ During 1864, because of the crisis that faced the club, letters to the press were extremely frequent. Typical examples in *Bell's Life* included, (16 Jan. 1864), p.3: 'The Marylebone Cricket Club is admitted to be the head of the cricket community; it is the House of Lords...'; 'Supplement' *Bell's Life* (30 Jan. 1864), p.2: 'We are content with the Marylebone Club, the very beauty of which lies in its not binding anyone imperatively, but only acting uprightly for the good of cricket'.

⁴ J. Pycroft, *Cricketana*, (Longmans, London 1865), p.28. Pycroft, like many of the others who raised the club to this level during the 1860s, had a specific reason for doing so. He was championing the club as the upholder of the true amateur position, above the depredations of the professional elevens. Victory for the club was a victory for the class.

Frederick Gale, who often wrote under the pseudonym of the 'Old Buffer'. A mere 20 years after the above illustrations were uttered, he summed up his feelings about the club in this way:

when they celebrate their centenary, as they will do in 1887, they may honestly look back, and feel that by steady management and careful preservation of all the traditions of the game, they have done a great national good, and one credited by the whole cricketing world as a loving and loyal fulfilment of a great public trust.¹

Later still writers as diverse as Lords Harris and Hawke,² Pelham Warner, and Major Phillip Trevor, all expressed this heroic view of the Marylebone CC as the great British institution, the guardian of cricket and its Anglo-Saxon code. Of all these Phillip Trevor was the most independent of observers, and he was a member of the club! Nevertheless, as a professional cricket writer, his comments are perhaps the most pertinent. In 1907 he wrote:

The MCC are, of course, an inseparable part of the national game, and if the trite simile of the Ivy and the Oak be used to describe the situation, it is an open question if the MCC are not in reality the Oak and the game of cricket the Ivy...It is as much a national institution as St.Paul's cathedral or Westminster Abbey, and more of a national institution than the House of Commons. It is, I indeed believe, the only pure English made and English controlled institution left in London. The Welshman does not affect it, nor does the typical Irishman. It manages to survive without the help of the administrative Scotsman. No German or American has a seat on its committee from which to dictate its policy. Here at least an Englishman may apply.³

It should not surprise us that Trevor was making a mildly implicit criticism that the club should interfere more than it did in the control of cricket. Despite this, Trevor was airing the fully developed myth of the Marylebone CC: that it was the most important institution in the development of the game of cricket; that it had become the ultimate

1 F.Gale, *Modern English Sports*, p.19.

2 'Throughout its existence the MCC has been the recognized head of the cricketing world', Lord Harris, in Lord Harris and F.S.Ashley-Cooper, *Lords and the MCC*, (London and Home Counties Press, London 1914), pp.235-6; Also note Lord Hawke's comments in *Recollections and Reminiscences*, pp.257-8: 'to no-one will I yield in my supreme affection for Lord's and MCC. To me Lord's is the Mecca of cricket, the sanctuary of the greatest game in the world...It is still by far the most influential club in the world of cricket and the maker of its laws'; Warner, *Imperial Cricket*, p.178, makes very similar points: '...in these days when cricket has got into the blood of the nation, and has become the interest of the whole nation, whither should the nation turn for guidance but to the club which has grown up with the game, which has fostered it, and which has always endeavoured to preserve its best traditions?'

3 Trevor, *The Problems of Cricket*, pp.1-2.

symbol of Englishness; that in its superiority to such 'foreign' infiltrated institutions as the House of Commons, it was like a House of Lords.

There were, of course, criticisms of the Marylebone CC, but these did nothing to alter the fundamentals of the myth that now surrounded the club. For example, the professional cricketer A.E.Knight, said in his extraordinary book *The Complete Cricketer*:

For many years after its [Marylebone CC] formation, the operations of the club were of a missionary character, ever gathering volume and a wider sweep...In some respects the Marylebone club is akin to that other House of Lords, which the American critic regarded as the saucer into which the hot liquor of reform was poured ere it was finally assimilated. Many an unwise suggestion has been tempered and cooled in this way, to the ultimate improvement of the game.¹

Knight was particularly critical of the cricket authorities connivance with shamateurism, and the poor treatment of professionals. By invoking the powerful traditions of the Marylebone CC he was hoping that they would abolish the difference between amateur and professional, and his references to the Marylebone CC acting in the best spirits of the game were a case of flattering to deceive. At the end of the passage he put the boot in when he stated that the 'dead impassive weight of this great club does indeed hang heavy upon the soul of some reformers'.² There is major significance here; the attack was framed within the confining limits of the myth of the Marylebone CC.

By the beginning of the war this mythology had become an entrenched invented tradition. Consequently, it is not surprising that histories of the club, and those of cricket in general, have ended up re-iterating this mythology of a club which had been powerful since its inception in the eighteenth century. Therefore, the work of Harris and Ashley-Cooper, which did much to consolidate the tradition, has often been reiterated. Pelham Warner's *Lords 1787-1945*,³ for example, covers a lot of the ground and subject matter of *Lord's and the MCC*, while Rait-Kerr's *The Laws of Cricket* states quite baldly that

we see, therefore, that 1787 is an important constitutional milestone since that year marks the passage from an epoch in which the revisions [of the law] were carried out at irregular intervals by committees appointed for the occasion, to one during which a single central authority has been in continuous session.⁴

1 A.E.Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, pp.24-5.

2 Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, p.26.

3 P.F.Warner, *Lord's 1787-1945*, (Pavilion Books, London 1987. Orig. pub.1946).

4 Col. R.S.Rait-Kerr, *The Laws of Cricket. Their History and Growth*, (Longmans, London 1950), p.24.

Given that these important writers on cricket were re-iterating the myth as historical fact,¹ it is unsurprising that Lewis repeats many of the ingrained assumptions of the past, although he does water down the idea of the supremacy of the club. Perhaps it is more surprising that he did not fall into all the usual pitfalls. But what is certain, is that to this day many cricket writers and lovers resist revisionist accounts of the history of the game and the Marylebone CC. For example, Derek Birley's *Willow Wand*, cricket's equivalent of *Eminent Victorians*, reduced some writers to paroxysms of rage, with one critic saying that it should join a list of works which were 'logical without necessarily being right'.² Similar criticisms were given to the works of Rowland Bowen³ and Christopher Brookes, both mentioned by Birley's critic as part of this peculiar cricket index of prohibited books. Such hostility to revisionism, undoubtedly the product of the innate conservatism which is so ingrained within the cricket establishment, has protected the prevailing myths about the Marylebone CC and cricket.⁴

This has made it extremely difficult for social historians to unravel the history of the Marylebone CC from its historical role, and has led to much confusion. For example, John Hargreaves in his important book *Sport, Power and Culture*, made the assertion that by the mid-eighteenth century, 'one centre was accepted as authoritative, the Marylebone Cricket Club'.⁵ Most, however, have followed the excellent scholarship of C. Brookes, who has written what is currently the received account of the Marylebone CC. Brookes was mildly critical of those cricket writers who had asserted that the Marylebone Club controlled cricket from the day of its existence, and to that extent offers a revisionist account.⁶ Brookes' account is as follows. The Club

1 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.3-9, recognises this serious problem in dealing with the historiography of cricket.

2 *Journal of the Cricket Society*, Vol.9, no.4, (1980), p.48.

3 R. Bowen, *Cricket: A History of its Growth and Development throughout the World*, (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1970). Bowen believed that before the 1860s many people modified or ignored the laws laid down by the Marylebone CC and cites as the most obvious example, the 6 ball over which was commonly used, but not ratified by Lord's (p.100). In a comparison of the Marylebone and Melbourne CCs he said that the latter 'came perilously near occupying a similar position...as does the Marylebone Cricket Club in England. Happily this did not occur' (p.132). Not a statement that would have pleased many traditionalists!

4 Even the usually inquisitive and distinctive Eric Midwinter believes that the Marylebone CC ruled cricket from its inception in 1787, see *Fair Game: Myth and Reality in Sport*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1987), p.42.

5 J. Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture*, p.17. This was a bold statement seeing that the Marylebone CC was not founded until 1787.

6 Brookes, *English Cricket*, p.68. He cites Altham's comment that by 1800 'Lord's is as an institution established high and dry beyond all rivalry'.

only started to make an impact on cricket beyond the confines of its own ground in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when Marylebone ceased to be a label for a collection of gentlemen and started to function like a true club.¹ From this date the club indeed had pretensions to ruling cricket, but these were challenged by the professionals over their newly developed round-arm and over-arm techniques, and then more explicitly through their bid to restructure cricket by founding their own professional elevens. It was only when this bid was finally defeated that the club and the counties started meaningfully to control cricket. Furthermore, it was not until 1894, when the Marylebone CC fully recognised and agreed to run the County Championship, that the club reached the zenith of its influence.²

This line has been broadly accepted by social historians as have his more detailed comments on the running of the club. His chapter on the formation of the County Championship deals most explicitly with the history of Marylebone. Rightly pointing out that the main driving force behind the formation of the championship was Surrey, he states that a lack of a strong central authority dogged the competition until 1894. Up to that time the only organisation that could have filled the vacuum was the Marylebone CC and they steadfastly eschewed this role.³ Nevertheless, he outlines a process of gradual rapprochement between the Marylebone CC and the counties for the period 1864-1894. Quite rapidly, the feeling between these two groups shifts from hostility to respect. Brookes is mystified by how this occurs and in the end explains the process in terms of class conciliation and the rise of the Victorian middle classes. He sees in 1870 a gulf between the middle classes, represented in cricket by the county organisations, and the aristocracy, represented by the Marylebone CC. This difference was one of life-styles and status. The middle classes were ambitious, thrusting businessmen, while the aristocracy was landed, leisured, possessed of hereditary power. Between 1870 and 1895 the distance between the two groups narrowed. The aristocracy lost much of their stability and structure as result of the agricultural depression and this led to a decline in status. Many of them went into business and a merger occurred with the middle classes. All this supposedly radically effects the Marylebone CC, whose internal social structure changes. Thus in 1877, out of 2291 members, 337 were titled members of the aristocracy. By 1915, out of 5,135 members, only 452 were titled. There therefore, it is alleged, occurred within the club a gelling of classes and hence the 'business aristocrats and their less exalted colleagues were a decisive influence on the affairs of

1 Brookes, *English Cricket*, p.70.

2 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.101-4.

3 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.120-1.

the MCC'. Thus these men brought 'fresh vision and a new sense of purpose to its activities'.¹

This line of argument was recently confirmed in R.Holt's excellent book *Sport and the British*, proving how important and influential the work of Brookes has been in this field.² Certainly, his study is well researched and provides an antidote for all those writers who have repeatedly re-iterated the mythology. But how accurate is the picture of the Marylebone CC that Brookes paints? This section offers a modification of his views, while not completely abandoning his description of cricket and class formation. Nevertheless, through a detailed examination of the committee, it will be demonstrated that Brookes' argument is simplistic. The conflict between the counties and the Marylebone CC was not necessarily a battle between the old landed aristocracy and the newly emergent middle classes. Neither was the process of class formation as seamless as Brookes suggests. Equally, the rapprochement between the two sides may have occurred at a much earlier date than previously supposed, with the Marylebone CC working as the hub of an informal network which combined to control cricket and its ideology for the benefit of class consolidation. The victory of the Marylebone as a focus for the control of cricket resulted in the consolidation of the mythology of the club and cricket. From this period the club was to become a symbol of Englishness, and British society, throughout the empire. This was the direct result of committee members and club supporters, who acted as the ideologues of the club, and while the history of cricket is undoubtedly not the history of Marylebone, and vice-versa, the club is entwined in the mythology of the game as part of the 'feudal' ideal and pre-industrial idyll that characterises the ideology of cricket.³

II

The Marylebone Committee and the Club: 1864-1914

The growth of the club and class formation

Between 1864 and 1914 the Marylebone CC underwent enormous changes, not just in its role in controlling cricket, but also in the size of its membership which expanded at a rapid pace from 1864 onwards (see Table 3.1). Inevitably this was to cause problems, as the club had to counter-balance the need for increased finance through subscriptions with desire to preserve the gentlemanly tone of the club. This was achieved through the traditional mechanism used by gentlemanly clubs: the use of a proposer, seconder; and, the blackball. At the same time it was essential that existing

¹ Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.13-5

² R.Holt, *Sport and the British*, pp.112-13.

³ The expression 'Feudal ideal' was used by D.Birley, *Willow Wand*, (Simon and Schuster, London 1989), ch.4, pp.38-49, to describe the class relations implicit in the mythology of cricket.

members conformed to the general codes of polite society. It was the role of the committee, not only to represent the interests of the club members, but also to ensure that elections were carried out properly and that members who had broken the rules were expelled from the club.

Table 3.1: Membership

Year	Nos.	+/-	Year	Nos.	+/-
1860	640	0	1888	3513	297
1861	641	1	1889	3595	82
1862	650	9	1890	3666	71
1863	650	0	1891	3769	103
1864	672	22	1892	3851	82
1865	755	83	1893	3941	90
1866	980	225	1894	4034	93
1867	1150	170	1895	4128	94
1868	c.+1200	?	1896	4197	69
1869	c.+1300	?	1897	4287	90
1870	1265	115	1898	4395	108
1871	1569	304	1899	4622	227
1872	1690	121	1900	4714	92
1873	1802	112	1901	4783	69
1874	1866	64	1902	4847	64
1875	2080	214	1903	4933	86
1876	2188	108	1904	4954	21
1877	2304	116	1905	5026	72
1878	2408	104	1906	5077	51
1879	2514	106	1907	5155	78
1880	2579	65	1908	5212	57
1881	2657	78	1909	5248	36
1882	2949	292	1910	5219	-29
1883	2863	-86	1911	5254	35
1884	2939	76	1912	5343	89
1885	3051	112	1913	5352	9
1886	3097	46	1914	n/f	
1887	3216	119			

Source: Harris, Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*

It is not coincidental that the sudden growth of the Marylebone CC occurred when London Society became an important and expanding feature of metropolitan dominant class life. Society began expanding from the traditional round of balls, presentation at Court and house calls, to sporting events, either where they could be connected with royal presence, as at Ascot, or where the events involved a contest between the élite educational establishments. Relevant here is the annual Eton against Harrow and Oxford against Cambridge matches, which had long been fixtures in the Lord's calendar. By the 1860s they had become two focal points in the Society season. Because these matches were traditionally held at Lord's, and thus the demand for good seating rose, there was a rise in demand for membership of the club, which would

grant the holder privileges at the annual encounters. Lord's and the Marylebone CC therefore became an integral part of the season and by the 1870s membership of the Marylebone CC gave members access to parts of the ground to which non-members were excluded. Membership served as a barrier against outsiders, in the same way that the Royal Enclosure functioned at Ascot.¹

This process led to the Marylebone CC becoming one of the important social institutions in the lives of the dominant class in London and an integral part of the creation of a new upper class. Class formation in the Victorian age was extremely complex and has been much debated. But broadly, the nineteenth century saw several different élite groups merge into a fairly coherent dominant class. This has been best described by John Scott in *The Upper Classes*. Scott traces the historical development of the three most privileged classes, whose wealth was based upon either land, commerce or industry. He believes that the growth of industry during the nineteenth century, combined with the relative decline of agriculture, and the continuing importance of trade and finance was a crucial part of the formation of a unified dominant class. By the end of the nineteenth century:

the landed, manufacturing and commercial classes had moved closer together in economic, cultural and political terms. Though not forming a unified social class, the three classes could no longer be considered as totally distinct from one another. The classes were on the verge of forming a single propertied class, but the differences in their market situations continued to separate them.²

Of course, one might also say that their relationship to the means of production and also to property, were becoming more closely linked, rather than stressing the differences in their market situations. But, the process of conjunction between these élite groups is still visible whatever theoretical stand one takes.³ Nevertheless, it has to

1 L.Davidoff, *The Best Circles. Society, Etiquette and the Season*, (Croom Helm, London 1973), pp.27-32.

2 J.Scott, *The Upper Classes. Property and Privilege in Britain*, (Macmillan, London 1986), p.78.

3 See in particular: H.Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1979) which charts the rise of what he calls a 'viable' class society; also see H.Perkin, *The Rise of Professional Society. England since 1880*, (Routledge, London 1989); W.D.Rubinstein, *Elites and the Wealthy in Modern British History*, (Harvester Press, Brighton 1987); F.M.L.Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society*. In all these works the authors are more interested in the middle classes, but the merging together of a dominant class is implicit in many of the assumptions that they make. It is also implicit in the conclusion of L. and J.C.F.Stone, *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1984). Unlike the other works, the Stones concentrate on the nature of the landed élite (and little else), believing that the myth of an open élite was exactly that. Indeed, they see the landed élite as being more or less socially closed. Nevertheless, they note that after 1880 this class lost most of its political power, and a lot of its prestige. British society became transformed into 'a more openly bourgeois society' (pp.424-5). Another clear statement

be emphasised, as Scott does, that the process was continual throughout this period and that there were still professions, occupations, or ways of making money that placed the person/family in question beyond the pale of Society, although in terms of power and wealth they might be located in the dominant class.¹

Society itself was a complex social mechanism directly related to the course of class formation. Within this piece of organic social machinery the Marylebone CC became a cog. To illustrate the relationship between these elements it is necessary to cite Davidoff's quasi-anthropological definition of Society:

[it was] a system of quasi-kinship relationships which was used to "place" mobile individuals during the period of structural differentiation fostered by industrialisation and urbanisation. As such it can be understood as a feature of a community based on common claims to status honour which in turn were based on a certain life-style. In this historical case such claims were defined as attributes of English Ladies and Gentlemen. Like all status groups the traditional aristocratic élite were obsessively concerned with the question of access to their ranks. New market conditions created a body of people making claims to social recognition as well as the political recognition of 1832 and 1867.²

As Society grew there was a growth in the different institutions that were part of this social mechanism. In the case of the Marylebone CC there is added significance in the fact that it was a club and therefore a voluntary association. With its rules of election it was able to regulate recruitment to its ranks by excluding all those it believed to be of lower social status. Membership of the club could act as part of a more general badge of social status and a level of acceptance. Like many other voluntary associations, it provided a line of demarcation between those who were acceptable and those who were not. In the case of the Marylebone CC those who were, by definition belonged to the dominant class. Of course, it was possible to be a member of the dominant class and unacceptable as a member of the Marylebone CC. But this just goes to demonstrate the importance of status positions within the structure of the dominant class.³

of the way in which this process of merging worked is seen in D.C.Coleman, 'Gentlemen and Players', *Economic History Review*, Vol.26, (1973), pp.92-116, which describes attitudes to industrialists and gentlemen, and the slow merging of two groups over a number of generations. Perhaps more interesting though are the comments of R.Miliband, the sociologist, who writing in the late 1960s observed the same process of class formation; Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society. The Analysis of the Western System of Power*, (Quartet Books, London 1973), p.42.

1 Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, p.24, relates how in the mid-Victorian era certain professions and certain businessmen were excluded from Society. Also see Coleman, 'Gentlemen and Players', for exclusion from Society of the 'practical' man.

2 Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, p.15.

3 Scott, *The Upper Classes*, p.90. He states 'acceptance as a gentleman by those who were already recognised as gentlemen defined a person as someone who mattered socially and politically. The fact

As the limits of Society grew, as the different élite groups moved closer together, encouraged by the expansion of the public school system, so too the membership role of the Marylebone CC expanded. Consequently, rules on election and blackballing were tightened up. According to Harris there was a constant redrawing of the rules to ensure that the right people were being elected between 1843 and 1914. For example, in 1876, 'stricter supervision and scrutiny were the features' of one re-appraisal and for the first time an artificial limit was set on the numbers that could be elected to the club.¹ By 1914 there were over 5000 members, but the waiting list was rumoured to have been around thirty years.² It is obvious, therefore, that as more people were elected, more care over who was being elected had to be exercised.

As one of the stages upon which the pageant of the Season was enacted, the importance of the Marylebone CC was large. Membership was a desirable badge of status and therefore could act as a forum, or gathering, of cricket loving-members of certain sections of the dominant class. But its status was built upon other things as well. Significant among these was the mythology of the club. Equally important were the actions of the committee and the role of the club as the upholder of the law of the most English of games. It is therefore necessary to look at the committee and the role which it played in the organisation and functioning of cricket, as well as the part that it played in the invention and maintenance of tradition. In these ways the club was not merely a reflection of the evolving class structure, but became an important element within that evolution. It not only reflected class, it helped create it and become part of the social fabric.

The structure of the committee

The committee was the apex of the club. Its structure remained markedly similar for the whole of this period. However, there were two major changes that occurred over this time. Firstly in 1865 new rules increased the numbers on the committee from 16 to 24.³ Thereafter, the committee now consisted of a president, secretary, treasurer and up to five trustees (all of whom were ex-officio members of the committee), the general committee making up the rest of the numbers. The second major change occurred in 1898, when, with the appointment of F.E. Lacey, the secretary ceased to

that status could be accorded or withdrawn at will by influential social circles without having to be justified in terms of any explicit, formal criterion, made it a curiously subtle and effective mechanism of social control'.

1 Harris and Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*, pp.215-27.

2 The only people who stood a chance of getting elected ahead of the waiting list were those who were good cricketers.

3 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 3 May 1865.

have an executive role on the committee. However, his power remained relatively undiminished as he retained an influential advisory role.

The pinnacle of the MCC and its figurehead, was the president, an office that was held for one year and one year only (except in exceptional circumstances).¹ By the rules of the club the president nominated his successor and on only one occasion during this period did the committee make a recommendation, when in 1879 William Nicholson was nominated as a gesture of thanks for his generosity to the club over the purchase of the ground. The importance of the president to the club is debatable. Lewis says 'the president was originally an aristocratic figurehead, a good name to have on the letterhead and in the chair at the anniversary dinner'.² But in reality the presidency was what the incumbent made it. The 5th Earl of Cadogan described the position as the 'Woolsack of cricket',³ which suggests that considerable power could be wielded (although Cadogan himself was forced to miss many meetings due to the illness and death of his father). Likewise, Lord Hawke, never one to underestimate a job, claimed that he turned down the offer of the presidency in 1900 because he 'had not the time to obey the calls such a post must make of its holder'.⁴ Some presidents were assiduous in their attention and actions, notably V.E.Walker (1891), W.E.Denison (1892), and Lord Harris (1895), while most fulfilled their role enthusiastically enough but slightly more sporadically. On the whole, as the MCC became more organised so did the role of the president. He was expected to serve on the Financial and other sub-committees, as well as fulfilling his role as figurehead and mouthpiece of the club. Thus, in 1890, the 22nd Baron Willoughby de Eresby was nominated to sit on the Finance, Tennis and Building committees.⁵ Others, like Lord Harris, were able to dominate all the actions of the club, but most notably the important Cricket and Selection sub-committee.

There are many reasons why the presidency should not be regarded as a mere figurehead job. Firstly, as chief representative presidents reflected and symbolised the whole tenor and atmosphere of the Marylebone CC. Thus, even if they did very little they were still a flesh and blood symbol. But more significantly many of the presidents were extremely active in the Marylebone CC before, during or after their term of office. If the year 1880 is taken at random, it is found that the president, Sir William Hart-Dyke, had served on the committee in previous years (1868-1871; 1873-1876). There were also three future presidents on that year's committee (Hon.R.Grimston; 5th Baron

1 Lord Hawke held the presidency for the duration of the First World War, as an emergency measure.

2 Lewis, *Double Century*, p.15.

3 Harris, Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*, p.229. Again it is worth noting the metaphorical use of the House of Lords.

4 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.260.

5 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 7 May 1890.

Lyttelton and V.E.Walker) and three past presidents (all three of whom were trustees of the club: the 4th Earl of Sefton; the 1st Earl of Dudley and William Nicholson). There was an unwritten rule that the retiring president was automatically elected onto the committee for at least the following year. Most importantly, it was a prerequisite that the president should have an active interest in the game of cricket.

The secretary and treasurer were on the next rung down the ladder but either could dominate the club. R.A.Fitzgerald was partially responsible for the Marylebone CC's reversal of fortunes when he served as secretary in the 1860s and early 1870s. His successor was Henry Perkins, an untidy yet forceful character, who was capable but slightly troublesome. Brookes actually puts much of the reform of the club down to him and there may be some truth in this as he was the first full time incumbent of the office.¹ Nevertheless, during his term (1876-1897) his position was equalled, if not eclipsed, by that of the treasurer, Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, who ruled the finances of the club from 1879-1916. Ponsonby-Fane was a born aristocrat and a long-standing member of the club.² His presence at committee meetings, often in the chair, was a constant feature and it is his signature which most frequently adorns the end of each meeting's minutes. But by the late 1890s he was an old man, having been born in 1824, and when Perkins retired it was F.E.Lacey who organised and all but ran the club. Between them Perkins and Ponsonby-Fane had worked hard but not efficiently. Perkins had little regard for procedure and the minutes during his term of office are written in an almost unreadable scrawl. When Lacey arrived the club's internal workings were in drastic need of reform and overhaul and he set about the task of making the club a more efficient organisation in its internal workings.³ Lacey reorganised the sub-committees and put the business of the club on a more formal basis. He also took over the running of the Refreshments Committee which had been an inefficient and heavily criticised area of the Marylebone CC's service and turned a loss-making concern into a profit making business. Lacey stamped his character on the post-Perkins Marylebone. Likewise, his influence on the wider sphere of cricket

1 Brookes, *English Cricket*, p.133.

2 Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane was almost the archetype of a Marylebone committee man. He was 55 years old when he became treasurer of the club. Although he had not been educated at one of the great public schools, which almost certainly means he was educated at home by a tutor, he was the brother of Frederick Ponsonby, a fellow committee member, who by this time had become the 6th Earl of Bessborough. Ponsonby-Fane worked in the Lord Chamberlain's Office as a civil servant. He exercised a dominant role within the club as treasurer until his death. Ponsonby-Fane's cricket pedigree was immaculate, as he happened to be a nephew by marriage of the first true dictator of Lord's, Lord Frederick Beauclerk, thus demonstrating the importance of kinship within the committee of the Marylebone CC.

3 B.Green (ed.), *The Wisden Book of Obituaries*, (Queen Anne Press, London 1986), p.259.

administration was not inconsiderable, demonstrating that even without serving on the committee, the secretary was a potentially powerful person.

The Trustees were also an important part of the committee as they fulfilled the role of club elder statesmen. Once appointed a Trustee that position was held until death. This was significant as they represented a static core in a changing committee, so much so that William Nicholson and R.J.P. Broughton served for the majority of the 1860-1914 period (49 and 51 years respectively). The trusteeship also enabled the Earl of Sefton to serve 35 years and V.E. Walker 39 years. This has implications for the way in which the club was run and the policies which it implemented. It certainly gave the committee an anchoring of conservatism.

The rank and file of the committee was also significant. Hawke commented on the ordinary committee that

[It consisted] of sixteen members, four of whom annually retire for re-election for one year. The retiring president always fills one of the four vacancies, and the candidates for the other three are proposed and seconded by members of the committee. It would be open to any member of the club to nominate a candidate for the committee, but this has never been done, and probably would be regarded as tantamount to proposing a vote of censure.¹

This reveals that the committee was, in a way, self-reproducing. They chose who they wanted and like all autocratic bodies, they got who they wanted. Usually the committee would put up four members for election, including the retiring president who was elected as a matter of courtesy by the Annual Meeting, but sometimes they would give the members a slightly wider choice. The general committee member was free to initiate business and put forward its own particular concerns. But committee members were also important because they formed the hard-core of the sub-committees, which effectively controlled the running of Lord's and cricket.

The committee had its own formal hierarchy, but it must be remembered that the Marylebone CC was a private club and all clubs have their own cliques. The Marylebone CC was no exception and reading the minutes it becomes very clear that this was how the club was run. As will be seen, the social background of the dominant clique was extremely important to the Marylebone's involvement in British and imperial cricket. Not surprisingly the dominant clique was based around the permanent ex-officio officers of the club. Between 1860 and 1869 it constituted among its members the figures of Hon.F. Ponsonby (later 6th Earl of Bessborough), T. Burgoyne (treasurer) and William Nicholson. After the death of Burgoyne in 1879, Sir Spencer

¹ Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.260.

Ponsonby-Fane was added to the ranks of the clique. It remained stable until the 1890s and it gathered around it the members of the Walker family and the Hon.R.Grimston. In the mid-1890s Lord Harris became the dominant figure at Lord's and he in turn gathered around himself the figures of Lord Hawke, P.F.Warner and others.

Any one who has participated in the running of a club will realise that dominant cliques will arise and often become of paramount importance. Other members will frequently attempt to break the power of the dominant influence of these informal oligarchies. This was what Fitzgerald attempted to achieve in the 1870s. He wanted to revivify the moribund complexion of the committee by introducing young blood. Edward Rutter commented in his memoirs that:

[Fitzgerald] had C.E.Green and myself nominated, and we proceeded to sit in conclave with our elderly and reactionary fellow members. At first we were distinctly ignored and Charlie Green was so utterly disgusted with the supercilious manner in which he was received [that he] vowed that he would never serve on the committee again.¹

On close examination it appears that Rutter's memory was deceiving him. The committee of 1875 upon which Rutter and Green sat had an average age of 40 years, with at least 14 members who were 40 or under. However what Rutter was referring to was the clique of Ponsonby, Burgoyne, Broughton, Nicholson and Grimston, all of whom were considerably older than the bulk of the committee.

To summarize, the structure of the committee was hierarchical, with a backbone of ex-officio members. Its membership was self-perpetuating through the nomination of its own replacements, but it was dominated by a limited number of individuals who could and did determine the policy of the Marylebone CC.

The Social Composition of the Committee ²

This study comprises an examination of the 145 members of the committee who served between 1860 and 1914: it is an attempt at a composite picture of the committee, i.e. their place within British society. If one is to take the line that the committee would reflect changes in society at large, as Brookes does, then one would expect to see an increase in those who might be bracketed within the upper-middle class, alongside a decline in the numbers of those from an aristocratic background. Along with this one would also expect a change in the distribution of places of education, moving from the

¹ Lewis, *Double Century*, p.125.

² This section was written with the aid of a multitude of secondary printed sources and reference works. These ranged from *Who Was Who*, to *The Dictionary Of National Biography* and beyond. It was also necessary to use old school registers and the Alumni lists of Oxford or Cambridge.

traditional Clarendon Schools, to an increase in the numbers educated within the broader public school system. Likewise, with those members of the Aristocracy that remained on the committee one would expect to see an increase in the numbers who held directorships, businessmen of rising social status. This study employs a series of social indicators to chart the changes that occurred over the period 1860-1914. These indicators include, education, derivation of wealth, holding of directorships, political beliefs and, most importantly, membership of a landowning class, besides many other incidental details.¹ The portrait that they reveal is broadly consistent with the overall

¹ The matter of assessing class position through these indicators is no easy task. The component parts of this list are the product of the writers own beliefs about class structure and class formation. As pointed out above, during the nineteenth century the process of integration that Scott describes did take place as one part in the production of two major polar class groups. On the one hand is the dominant class, which monopolises positions of power and wealth; the capitalists and their ideological allies. On the other hand stands the subordinate class, whose position in relation to the means of production is subordinate to that dominant class. These people only have their labour to sell and unlike members of the dominant class possess insignificant property. There are, of course a myriad of other classes that stand in between, but historically the relationship between the major classes has tended to condition relations with and between the other classes. This thesis is particularly interested in the formation of the dominant class and it is informed by the belief that status is an important determinant within the construction of that class. Indeed, the desire for social improvement has been described by some historians as a major engine of class development: Perkins, *The Rise of Professional Society*, p.63; Coleman, 'Gentlemen and Players', p.95. Nevertheless defining membership of a class is a difficult task, as unlike for occupations there is no such thing as a status classification table. Consequently historians have often been left to their own devices to decide what defines and differentiates class position. This malaise has led to much criticism from conservative historians like Rubinstein. In *Elites and the Wealthy in Modern British History*, he sets out his own criteria for demonstrating the creation of a meritocratic society, based upon his research in probate records. His class structure appears to consist of a landed élite (which like the Stone's is relatively closed), a collection of élites in the middle and a working class that is missing presumed non-existent. Implicit in Rubinstein's argument is that wealth holding was a major constituent of class position and in particular inherited wealth. He attacks the idea that indicators like education can be used as determinants of class position, preferring to rely on probate and the father's social position. Indeed, his 'indices' include probate valuation of each person's father, the father's social status (which seems to be almost exclusively based on wealth), as well as education and geographical location of childhood. Indicators he totally ignores are the possibility of extended kinship, the social position of the mother and the voluntary associations to which these people belonged. His attempt to prove that there was a large extent of 'social mobility' in Britain (p.172) seems to fall flat on its face, as his data shows that until 1940 members of the 'missing' working class are not in with a shout of clawing up Rubinstein's ladder of preferment (p.185-200). So much for mobility! My own indicators are also based partially on the idea of a hereditary society, not least because class cannot exist unless there is some form of inter-generational social closure, but they are also based upon education, as this was a means of buying a child into the social network of the dominant class. Equally, my category on membership of the landowning class will be treated as important. This class is an extended group which consists not just of those that inherited land, but also younger sons, brothers and husbands. For who will differentiate in class position between Frederick Ponsonby, 6th Earl of Bessborough, and his brother Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane? To do so would be tricky and deny the importance of kinship. For a good introduction to the sociology of class and class formation see, A.Giddens, *The Class Structure in Advanced Societies*, (Hutchinson, London 1981), esp.

picture of class formation in this era, although care has to be taken with the assessment of the data. For this reason it was necessary to examine the committee at five-yearly intervals so changes over time could be taken into account, naturally weighting the data towards those who remained on the committee for a prolonged amount of time. What this reveals is that the structural changes in committee composition which one might expect to observe do in fact take place. However, due to the dominant influence exerted by a minority, we should be wary of concluding that policy changes in relation to the counties and colonies were a direct result of the changing composition of the committee's membership. The change was, in reality, a change in the personal composition of the most influential group on the committee.

The presidency and the committee: 1860-1914. An over-view

The presidency had an aristocratic image and indeed the majority of them were of that ilk, if not actual earls or lords, then the brothers or sons of peers, and knights and baronets.¹ There were obvious exceptions to this rule. In 1879, William Nicholson, whose money was made in gin distilling and whose family usually included M.P.'s, became president, while in 1891 V.E.Walker, whose family made their money in the Taylor and Walker brewery, was also a non-aristocratic incumbent of the office. There were several others who were extremely high-ranking barristers but certainly not peers of the realm, including Sir Henry James, the Attorney General at the time that he was president (1889), and Sir A.L.Smith, Lord Justice of Appeal during his year of office (1899). But all of those who were not aristocrats definitely moved with ease in that milieu.

The majority of presidents, not surprisingly, went to Eton (52%), while a significant minority attended Harrow (30%). It was more common for presidents after 1900 to have attended other schools, which reflects the growth of public school foundations after 1850. But it must be noted that in numerical terms only 9 out of a total of 54 did not attend either Eton or Harrow, which demonstrates the extent to which the presidents were chosen from the élite section of British society. Indeed, if more emphasis is needed, generally those who were not titled had been at one of the two schools and had therefore been integrated into the upper echelons of society.

chs. 6-7 on his rethinking of the theory of class. Other interesting and pertinent studies of class in history include R.S.Neale, *Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1972), and *Class in English History, 1680-1850*, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1981), which both argue for a five-class model of society; and, A.Giddens and P.Stanworth, *Elites and Power in British History*, (Cambridge University Press, London 1974).

¹ It is worth concentrating on the presidency as an important sub-group within the committee, not least because 55 out of the total of 145 committee members served as president. On any given committee there would be at least 3, and often more, ex-presidents.

This pattern of education is reinforced by the numbers attending either Oxford or Cambridge (77%), with Oxford being the more popular (44%) and Cambridge a few points behind (33%). The most likely college at which they would matriculate was Christ Church (67% of the total) if at Oxford, or Trinity (89% of the total) if at Cambridge. This, of course, did not mean that they all obtained degrees, many followed the traditional pattern of 'going up' to university for a term or two and then 'coming down' without graduating. Others gained their higher education in the army, which they left after a while.

In adult life it is harder to gauge what some of them did because not a few were probably gentlemen of leisure. However, some resorted to their land and did little else save live a squirearchical life and get involved in cricket (V.E.Walker was a non-aristocratic example of this). Many had business connections in the form of directorships both of the active and passive kind(46%), a factor that becomes increasingly more important after 1885. Other presidents were among the great landowners of Britain, including the 6th Duke of Buccleuch, who owned 460,000 acres worth about £217,000 per annum in 1883, and the 9th Duke of Devonshire whose properties were estimated at 198,572 acres worth £180,750 a year in 1883.¹ Others could be ranked amongst the great landed industrialists of their day, including the Earl of Dudley, who owned mines, and the 6th Earl Dartmouth, whose estates included huge coal deposits.² But the most commonly identifiable profession among the presidents was law and in particular the Bar (13%), while colonial administration and politics were also recognizable areas of involvement. In administration we see the 2nd Baron Wenlock (Governor of Madras 1891-95), Lord Harris (India Office and Governor of Bombay 1890-1895), and the 7th Earl of Jersey (Governor-General of New South Wales 1890-1893). In politics there were the significant figures of the

1 All figures on land were taken from J.Bateman, *The Great Landowners*, (Harrison and Sons, London 1883). Both of these landlords were among the very wealthiest of landowners (Notably, both of them became company directors as well as having large land-holdings). The Devonshire family in particular capitalised on its landed value in the construction of Eastbourne. For details of this see, D.Cannadine, *Lords and Landlords: The Aristocracy and the Towns, 1774-1967*, (Leicester University Press, Leicester 1980) which gives a detailed description of the Devonshires and the building of Eastbourne. Also note that rentals from town buildings were sometimes not included in Bateman's assessment. This could be a very large part of an aristocrats income. Several of those who were presidents of the Marylebone CC gained much of their income this way, including the Seftons, and the Fitzwilliams.

2 D.Cannadine, *Lords and Landlords*, p.41. Dudley and Dartmouth were two aristocrats who drew enormous rentals from mining.

Honourable Alfred Lyttelton, the leading Liberal Unionist and Colonial Secretary,¹ and W.H.Long, the notable conservative politician.²

The pattern of political beliefs is the most interesting and significant aspect of the presidency during this period. From 1860-1914 57% were Conservative, while 37 % were Liberal or Liberal Unionist (after 1885 very few of those who were Liberal remained loyal to Gladstone). However, between 1860 and 1885, there were more Liberals than Conservatives. The Conservative majority only becomes apparent after the Home Rule crisis. This reflects the typical pattern of dominant class beliefs during this period with political polarisation becoming more pronounced after 1885.

The presidents of the MCC were members of an exclusive British élite and this is seen in their whole set of values: belief in the ideals of political service, the obligations of the landowner and the rightness of the hierarchical nature of society. Their wealth and prestige lends credence to the figurehead theory of the presidency if we did not know that many of them actively served on the committee before and after their terms of office.

The social and political background of the general committee reveals a slightly wider spectrum of schooling and professional activities. Indeed, the whole feeling of the general committee was more upper-middle class than aristocratic. Eton was still the most attended of the public schools (34%), with Harrow₂ distant second place (15%). But there was a much wider range of schools in evidence, including Uppingham, Lancing, Loretto, Edinburgh Academy, Rossal¹, Marlborough, Malvern and Wellington, as well as the more established Rugby, Winchester and Charterhouse. Equally, less of the general committee attended Oxford and Cambridge (34% and 23% respectively), and those that did went to a broader selection of colleges. Likewise, there was a broader range of professions, but like the presidents, overwhelmingly the most popular was Barrister-at-Law (28%), while that of Solicitor also proved a fairly wide choice (9%). The only other significant minority was the Armed forces (13%), otherwise we see a large variety of jobs including those involved in business (Stockbrokers, merchants, company directors), while there were also public schoolmasters, an artist, a surgeon, a clergyman and at least one person who classified himself as having 'no profession'.

The bond which held these people together was cricket. At no time during this period did the number of first class cricketers on the committee, playing and retired, drop below 45%. At most times it was considerably higher. Even those who could not

¹ Who also happened to be a barrister, under whom Pelham Warner was a junior.

² Not only was he a notable politician, but he also had considerable land-holdings. He owned 15,404 acres at £23,213 per annum. He was married into the aristocracy.

be classified as first class were keen players or spectators. On this basis, we can conclude that at least the committee was qualified to discuss cricketing matters, if not actually to rule cricket.

Unfortunately, it is considerably harder to gauge the political convictions of general committee members. For example, throughout this period at least half of every committee had unknown political beliefs. It is interesting to note that the figure for Conservative support in 1914 is at least 45%, by far the highest figure of the whole period. However, these figures do tend to fluctuate, due to the high proportion of unknowns, making any statement highly debatable. But, given the fact that the presidency became a Conservative reversion during the later years of this period, it is not an unreasonable assumption that the political persuasions of the committee as a whole followed this lead.

It is not difficult to see that on this basic level, taking into consideration the differences between education, profession and landownership, that the whole period of 55 years, those who served as presidents were, generally, in terms of status, from a higher position within the dominant class. This was not co-incidental. The position of president was one that required a man of very high status, to represent the hierarchical nature of cricket. The ideology of cricket demanded that the person who occupied 'the woolsack of cricket' should come from the same social background as the person who occupied the real 'woolsack'. The mythology of the Marylebone CC also demanded that this was the case. An historically aristocratic institution, which was one of the nexus points for Society, needed a blue-blooded head. The appointment of a man of such status was guaranteed by the process of self-election, whereby the out-going president nominated the in-coming. Therefore, the presidency was recruited from a small group, which frequently had other connections with the long-standing members of the committee. In such a way the social tone of the club and, indeed, the committee was defined.

The Changing composition over time

Statistics, especially averages, can be extremely misleading and it would be simplistic to take the aggregate of all those who served on the committee over this period. The 54 years are ones of considerable social, economic and political change. Some of those who are included in the statistics were merely on the committee in the early years of the 1860s, while others only appear at the very tail end of this period. Each committee was therefore reconstructed year by year and a detailed breakdown, in social terms, of one committee every five years was made. The study is concentrated upon landed ties, derivation of wealth, titles, political belief, directorships etc. All these

things indicate that the committee was located within the newly emerging dominant class of landed aristocrats, businessmen^{and} professionals.

(a) Age and recruitment

Table 3.2 indicates that there was a dramatic change in the age profile of the committee from 1860 to the end of the period. Over 55 years the average age rises by nearly 20 years. The reason for this appears to be two-fold. Firstly, several of the ex-officio members of the committee were getting extremely old in the post-1900 period.

Table 3.2: Average age of the committee at five-yearly intervals

Year	Age	Year	Age
1860	38	1890	51
1865	43	1895	52
1870	42	1900	52
1875	40	1905	54
1880	46	1910	57
1885	47	1914	56

Source: *Who Was Who*; *D.N.B.* etc.
Age= To nearest whole figure

For example, in 1905, William Nicholson had reached 80 years of age, while R.J.P.Broughton was 88 and Spencer Ponsonby-Fane was 89. So, although there was an age range of 27 (R.E.Foster) to 89, the high number of those over 60 years of age (8 out of 22) was enough to force the average up. But this is not the whole reason. The change in the age of presidents (before 1885 the average age is 42 years, while afterwards it is nearly 51),¹ demonstrates that they too were getting older and were therefore more likely to recruit from their own age/peer group. It is possible to assert that by the end of this period this was direct policy and while young cricketers were still being co-opted onto the committee in the latter part of the period,² this became increasingly rare. Indeed, the youngest member of the committee in 1914 was 36 and he happened to be the only one under 40. This in itself shows the stability of the committee, which resulted in the extraordinary situation of only 145 people serving over a period of 55 years. Recruitment patterns to the committee reflect this situation by drawing from a narrow, closed group, indicating the exclusivity of the body. Consequently, looking at the names of the younger people serving at the end of the period, one is struck by the fact that the vast majority of them were selected on the basis

1 In 1860, for example, the president of that year was the 2nd Baron Skelmersdale, who was 23 years old at the time.

2 For example, in 1900 Gregor Macgregor, of Middlesex (30 years old), and F.S.Jackson of Yorkshire (29 years old) served on the committee.

of being the most acceptable, in social terms, of the best amateur cricketers, while avoiding those that appeared to be tainted by accusations of shamateurism.¹

(b) Education

Since the Marylebone CC committee were regarded as an élite group one would expect the proportion of members having attended Eton, Harrow or another Clarendon School to have been very high.² This is exactly what occurs, as revealed by Table 3.3a. Nevertheless, over the period the number of committee members who had attended one of the Clarendon Schools declined, although not dramatically, in relation to the number of those who attended other public schools. This decline was real, but sporadic. However, despite the decrease in relative importance of the Clarendon schools, this group remains predominant upon the committee. Thus, while the public school system was blossoming during the latter years of the nineteenth century, on the committee, it was the traditional schools that still counted for the most. Nevertheless, attendance at one of the new Woodward schools, or an institution like Loretto did not disqualify an individual from sitting upon the Marylebone committee. This reflected both the continued importance of the older schools,³ as well as the extent to which the members

1 These included Jackson, Macgregor, Shuter, Warner and Foster, all of whom would have been regarded as socially acceptable in terms of their social background. Jackson, although the son of an industrialist, had been educated at Harrow and Trinity College Cambridge. He was probably the best amateur all-rounder of his day and was a personal friend and understudy of Lord Hawke at Yorkshire. By 1905 he had acquired the title of Hon. as his father had been elevated to the peerage as Lord Allerton. See J.P.Coldham, *F.S.Jackson. A Cricketing Biography*, (Crowood, Marlborough 1989). P.F.Warner was from an imperial background, his father having been the Attorney-General of Trinidad. His family were relatively impecunious, but by birth and education he was located within the domain of the imperial upper-service-class, although he may not have had the social credentials of a younger son of a peer. Warner was educated at Rugby, one of the Clarendon Schools, and then went on to Oriel, Oxford. During his youth he was primed for amateur cricket by playing on the aristocratic country house cricket circuit. Through playing for Middlesex he had direct connections with the Marylebone CC and by this time had been befriended by Lord Hawke, see G.Howat, *Plum Warner*, (Unwin Hyman, London 1987). Like Jackson, Warner was one of the amateurs who seemed relatively untouched by the taint of shamateurism, despite his extremely small personal income. Those amateurs who were touched by such accusations do not seem to have been allowed to serve on the committee. C.B.Fry, for example, was often invited to serve upon selection committees but was never on the committee itself. Others like A.C.Maclaren and A.E.Stoddart seemed to be ruled out both by their middle-class backgrounds and the frequent accusations aimed at them about receiving pecuniary reward from the game, see D.Frith; 'My Dear Victorious Stod'. *A Biography of A.E.Stoddart*, (Lutterworth Press, Guildford 1977), pp.126 and 144.

2 The other Clarendon Schools being Winchester, Westminster, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Charterhouse, St.Paul's and Merchant Taylor's.

3 Scott, *The Upper Classes*, p.107. He maintains that while attendance at any public school gave enhanced opportunities for the recipients, the major public schools retained a crucial role in Victorian society. This is certainly borne out by this study.

of the committee conformed to social patterns within Society at large.¹ A similar pattern was seen in the figures for those who had had higher education (see Table 3.3b). Although there was much variation, attendance was high, 1905 being an exceptional year with over 95 % of the committee having received higher education. As concerned the places of higher education, only those who attended Military training remained relatively static, while, Oxford and Cambridge appear to have varied in popularity on no particular criteria. Once again, these factors reflect developments within Society and society at large.

Table 3.3a :Attendance at schools at five-yearly intervals²

Year	Eton	Harrow	Other Clarendon	Other P.S. ³	Other	Total (%) & No. ⁴
1860	56.3	25.0			18.8	100 (16)
1865	47.1	29.4	5.9		17.6	100 (17)
1870	36.4	50.0		4.5	9.1	100 (22)
1875	39.1	39.1	8.7	4.3	8.7	100 (23)
1880	37.5	25.0	16.7	4.2	16.7	100 (24)
1885	41.7	25.0	8.3	12.5	12.5	100 (24)
1890	33.3	25.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	100 (24)
1895	39.1	30.4	8.7	13.0	8.7	100 (23)
1900	27.3	31.8	4.5	18.2	18.2	100 (22)
1905	31.8	22.7	13.6	22.7	18.2	100 (22)
1910	40.9	22.7	13.6	13.6	9.1	100 (22)
1914	27.3	18.2	22.7	13.6	16.7	100 (22)
Total	37.5	28.7	9.6	10.7	13.4	100 (261)

Source: Various school registers; *Who Was Who*; *D.N.B.*

1 For the history of the development of the Public School system at this time see: T.W.Bamford, *Rise of the Public Schools. A Study of Boys' Public Boarding Schools in England and Wales from 1837 to the Present Day*, (Nelson, London 1967); J. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon*; J.R.de S.Honey, *Tom Brown's Universe*, (Millington, London 1977). For a detailed study of a single public school see T.J.H.Bishop, R.Wilkinson, *Winchester and the Public School Elite*, (Faber and Faber, London 1967).

2 Figures given as a percentage. The sources for this table are a varied range of reference works, mostly school registers, and are cited in the bibliography.

3 Other recognised Public School. For the range and extent of these from 1880 see J.R. de S.Honey, 'Tom Brown's Universe: The Nature and Limits of the Victorian Public Schools Community', in B.Simon and I.Bradley (eds.), *The Victorian Public School. Studies in the Development of an Educational Institution*, (Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1975), pp.28-9. For the purposes of this study P.S. represents all schools in his Groups I-III.

4 Figure in brackets is the total number of committee members on the committee of that year.

Table 3.3b: Higher education at five-yearly intervals¹

Year	Oxford	Cambridge	Military 2	Total (%)
1860	25.0	18.8	18.8	62.6
1865	29.4	41.2	17.6	88.2
1870	40.9	36.4	13.6	90.9
1875	43.5	39.1	13.0	95.6
1880	29.2	41.7	8.3	79.2
1885	25.0	33.3	8.3	66.6
1890	29.2	33.3	8.3	70.8
1895	30.4	17.4	13.0	60.8
1900	18.2	45.5	13.6	77.3
1905	45.5	36.4	13.6	95.5
1910	40.9	36.4	9.1	90.9
1914	36.4	31.8	9.1	77.3
Total	33.0	34.5	11.9	79.4

Source: *Alumni Oxoniensis*; *Alumni Cantabrigienses*; *Who Was Who*.

The old places of learning were no longer reserved for those who wanted to join the clergy, or who happened to be members of the aristocracy. Like the public schools, attendance at Oxford or Cambridge began to replace the system of individual patronage as a means of acquiring top social positions.³ Nevertheless the figures do appear to be very high. The reason for this cannot solely be located in changes within society. It was also the result of the important cricketing connections between the Universities, cricket and the Marylebone CC.

(c) Wealth, occupation, land and titles

The studies of Scott, Rubinstein and many other historians and sociologists have revealed that there was a gradual merging of élites during this period. At the same time there was an expansion in the professions and a growing social respectability in the exercise of business. Equally, there was a contraction in the importance of landownership, although the landowning class managed to retain a part-share of political, economic and social power, along with the newer élite groups.⁴ A study of the committee of the Marylebone CC reveals that this process of class formation was happening on that body as well as in the rest of society. Table 3.4, indicates that over the period as a whole, on the committee there was an increase in importance of urban professions and business as a means of earning income relative to other categories, although this group was actually predominant for the whole period. A more detailed

¹ As a percentage of the total number on the committee of each committee.

² Includes Sandhurst; Woolwich; and Dartmouth.

³ Scott, *The Upper Classes*, p.107.

⁴ J.V.Beckett, *The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914*, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1986), pp.460-7.

examination of this, with a breakdown between the professions and business (Tables 3.5 a-c) demonstrates that the professions, and especially the traditional professions, remained the most important aspect of this group. Thus, by the latter part of this period some of the most distinguished barristers in the country had been important members of the Marylebone CC committee, including A.G.Steel, Lord Alverstone and the Hon. Alfred Lyttelton. There were as well a number of solicitors, a profession that was generally regarded as much less prestigious than their colleagues at the bar. Nevertheless, this group was almost continually represented on the committee, suggesting that either in cricket at the highest levels such distinctions were less important, or that these were solicitors who were socially acceptable. Most important of the solicitors was R.J.P.Broughton, who served for the vast majority of this period and whose background as a solicitor does not seem to have hindered him from exercising his influence, although admittedly he never held the presidency.¹ The majority of the other professions consisted of members of the civil service, although by the end of the period members of the stock-exchange become an important sub-group, once again reflecting the growing importance of commerce and the rise of the stock-exchange as an important part of the City. Fully fledged businessmen, whose main income was derived from business, were a varied and important group within the committee. They included figures as diverse as Lord Harris, who by 1914 was a director of many gold companies,² the Hon. Robert Grimston, who was heavily involved in the telegraph industry from a very early date, to Andrew Rutter who was a partner in the family brickmaking firm. Table 3.5c demonstrates the over-all importance of the professions and business to the derivation of wealth of committee members. Table 3.6, which looks at the numbers that held directorships, confirms the patterns observed above. Equally, they are a striking representation of the increase in the volume of business on the stock-exchange as well as the vast increase in this period of the number of members of the dominant class who held directorships.

1 In Frederick Gale's testimony on the life of committee member and club president Hon. Robert Grimston, he makes this interesting remark about his subject's time as a barrister: 'It must be remembered that in those days it was deemed *infra dig.* for a barrister to be seen in the company of solicitors, as it might be thought an indirect way of fishing for business', Gale, *Memoir of the Hon. Robert Grimston*, (Longmans, Green, London 1885), pp.55-6. Presumably, cricket, with its peasant and peer ideology, could provide a meeting ground for the likes of Broughton and Grimston, although the committee of the Marylebone CC seems an odd place for them to mix if this division existed. What seems more likely, is that certain solicitors, depending on power and status were not '*infra dig.*'

2 Among them Consolidated Gold, South Africa, of which he was chairman.

Table 3.4: Primary derivation of wealth of the committee by five-yearly intervals ¹

Year	A	B	C	D	E
1860	37.5		18.8	18.8	25.0
1865	41.2		11.8	17.6	29.4
1870	50.0			22.7	27.3
1875	56.5		8.7	13.0	21.7
1880	54.2	14.2	4.2	16.7	20.8
1885	45.8	8.3		25.0	20.8
1890	58.3	4.2		25.0	12.5
1895	47.8	8.7		26.1	17.4
1900	59.1	4.5		18.2	18.2
1905	68.2			18.2	13.6
1910	45.5			31.8	22.7
1914	54.5			22.7	22.7
Total %	52.1	2.7	3.1	21.5	20.7

Source: Various, incl.: *Who Was Who*; *D.N.B.*; Bateman's *Landowners* etc.

A= Urban Professional; B=Public Administration; C= Armed Forces; D= Landed Wealth; E= Unspecified.

¹ There are 5 different categories in this section: (a) Urban professional which includes a number of different occupations ranging from those working in the legal profession, medicine etc., those businessmen who derive their wealth mostly from directorships and members of the stock-exchange; (b) Civil and Imperial administration (Civil Service); (c) Armed forces; (d) those who derive their wealth from the land; (e) Unspecified or unlocated. It must be noted that this classification is specifically different to Vamplew's, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, pp.287-301. In the appendix he gives an occupational and spatial analysis of shareholders in Football clubs in England, Wales, and Scotland, as well as examining the shareholders of sports companies by the same criteria. By necessity he adopts an occupational classification that is much broader as it has to encompass a wider section of the class and occupational structure. There is also a specific difference between derivation of wealth and occupation which tends to obscure the issue, making the use of an occupational classification impractical for this thesis. For example, Vamplew's classification is: 'A. Aristocracy and gentry; B. Upper professional; C. Lower professional; D. Proprietors and employers associated with the drink trade; E. Other proprietors and employers; F. Managers and higher Administration; G. Clerical; H. Foremen, supervisors, and inspectors; I. Skilled Manual; J. Semi-skilled manual; K. Unskilled manual; L. Untraced or unspecified'. see fn,1, p.301. In terms of a class analysis of the committee members this does little to help, as groups C-E and G-K are completely invisible. Equally, there are many cases where a member of the aristocracy also happens to be a businessman, a classic example of this being Lord Harris, who by the turn of the century had over 5 directorships in gold companies that must have dwarfed his income from land, which in 1883 was a 'meagre' £7237 p.a. By concentrating on the derivation of wealth, rather than occupation, we have a set of figures that complement those on landownership and directorships. Bearing in mind that status within the dominant class was derived from a number of different indicators, which included, land, wealth, marriage, family history, education, clubs, friends and many other things, it would be wrong to over-emphasise occupation. Of most interest in this set of figures is the predominance of classification A, which when examined in conjunction with actual professions and directorships indicates the growing importance of business, and the merging of the aristocracy, gentry, businessmen and professionals into a cohesive dominant class. Vamplew's categories were developed from Armstrong's skills and occupation classification, see W.A.Armstrong, 'The Use of Information about Occupation', in E.A.Wrigley, *Nineteenth Century Society. Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data*, (Cambridge University Press, London 1972). Again, Armstrong's classification is of limited value because every individual in the Data set was from social class I. See pp.198-214. It is not necessarily to be believed that occupation is the best guide to social class (p.202).

Table 3.5a: Professions¹

Year	Bar.	Sol.	Forces	Other	% ₂
1860	2	1	3		37.5
1865	2	2	3		41.2
1870	6	3			40.9
1875	7	2	3		52.2
1880	6	2		2	41.7
1885	5	2		1	33.3
1890	7	1		1	37.5
1895	3	3		2	34.8
1900	4	3		2	40.9
1905	4	2		2	36.4
1910	3	2		4	40.9
1914	4	1		4	40.9
Total	53	24	9	18	39.8

Sources: Various, incl.: *Who Was Who* ; *Foster's Men at the Bar* ; *D.N.B.* etc.

Key: Bar.= Barrister; Sol.= Solicitor; Forces = A member of the Armed Forces³; Other = Other recognised professionals⁴

By the mid-1890s, many of those who held directorships were titled, indicating the new importance of this as a means of supplementing or earning income, or even, in some cases of extending their power. Indeed, it has been stated that by 1896 a quarter of all peers held directorships, in the culmination of a process which started in the 1870s when landowners began to join the boards of joint stock companies in droves.⁵ On the Marylebone CC committee this figure was actually much higher, although directorships were not limited to aristocrats. Thus, by 1914, Lords Hawke and Harris, the Duke of Buccleuch (who died that year and was succeeded on the committee by his son), the Earl of Lichfield, Baron Desborough ^{and} the Duke of Devonshire all held directorships.⁶ On top of this, the Hon. F.S.Jackson had graduated to holding directorships in a number of companies

1 This table is confined to all those who were recognised professionals. It does not include managing or other directors etc.

2 Percentage of professionals on the committee of each year.

3 Those currently serving in the Armed Forces. Does not include those who had retired. For a reflection of the number of committee men who had served in the forces and were retired, Table 3.3b (further education) gives a good indication.

4 Other recognised professions incl.: Civil Servants; clergy; doctors/surgeons; architects; stock brokers; or any other body that had a professional association.

5 Scott, *The Upper Classes*, p.85. This partly stemmed from the belief that a 'lord on the board' would make shares more saleable.

6 It is interesting to note the inclusion in this list of the Buccleuch and Devonshire families. Neither family would have needed to join boards to supplement dwindling incomes and therefore their motives must have been vastly different ^{from} those of the impoverished aristocrats who needed to supplement their incomes by holding directorships. Presumably they found it attractive to extend their power and influence, as well as increasing their wealth by this method.

unconnected with the family business, presumably as a result of his father's elevation to the peerage as well as his own celebrity as a cricketer,¹ while another three non-titled committee members also held positions on company boards.

Table 3.5b: Businessmen by five-yearly intervals²

Year	Businessmen	%
1860	3	18.8
1865	3	17.6
1870	2	9.1
1875	4	18.2
1880	6	25.0
1885	4	16.7
1890	7	29.2
1895	4	17.4
1900	5	22.7
1905	6	27.3
1910	3	13.6
1914	5	22.7
Total	52	19.9

Sources: Various, incl.: Skinner's *Directory of Directors*; *Who was Who*; *D.N.B.*

Table 3.5c: Professions and businessmen as a percentage of each committee at five-yearly intervals

Year	Professions	Business	Total
1860	37.5	18.8	56.3
1865	41.2	17.6	58.8
1870	40.9	9.1	50.0
1875	52.2	18.2	70.4
1880	41.7	25.0	66.7
1885	33.3	16.7	50.0
1890	37.5	29.2	66.7
1895	34.8	17.4	52.2
1900	40.9	22.7	63.6
1905	36.4	27.3	63.7
1910	40.9	13.6	54.5
1914	40.9	22.7	63.6
Total	39.8	19.9	59.7

Source: Various: as for Tables 3.5 a-b

1 Jackson had previously been a director of Jackson's Stores Ltd., but now was involved with: Beyer, Peacock and co.Ltd.; The Great Northern Railway; and 2 other companies. This surely represents a gain in status.

2 All those who were primarily involved in business, including managing directors and active directors, like Lord Harris.

Table 3.6: Number of committee members who held directorships at five-yearly intervals¹

Year	Directorships	% ²
1860	3	18.8
1865	3	17.6
1870	2	9.1
1875	3	13.0
1880	5	20.8
1885	8	33.3
1890	4	16.7
1895	7	30.4
1900	8	36.4
1905	9	40.9
1910	9	40.9
1914	11	50.0
Total	72	27.6

Source: Skinner's *Directory of Directors*.

The general pattern of class formation is further seen in two other areas (see Tables 3.7a-b), these being the number of committee members who were either landowners or connected to the landowning class by kinship. The data were organised by the stratification constructed by Bateman in his work on land-holders in Britain and indicates that on the committee as in society as a whole the importance of landowners was declining. However, this decline was relative, for even in 1914 50% of the committee were connected to the landowning class. What is also extremely interesting, is that compared with Bateman's calculations, classifications I-IV are over-represented, while V-VII are under-represented, indicating that members of the landowning class on the committee came from families that were among the larger property holders in Victorian Britain. At the same time, Table 3.8 indicates that by the end of the period there were actually more aristocrats serving on the committee. It seems that, at least on the Marylebone CC committee, despite aristocratic power in the world outside being on the wane, landowners and title holders still held a great deal of importance and still wielded large amounts of power. This trend actually seems to run counter to the one identified by Brookes in the club. He sees the number of aristocrats in the club declining. The figures that he gives for this are that in 1877 there were 337 aristocrats from a membership of 2,291, while in 1886 the numbers declined to 327 out of 5,091. By 1915 he believes that there had been a slight recovery with aristocrats representing 452 out of a membership of 5,135. As can be seen from Table 3.1, he has made a mistake which drastically alters his figures, for the membership in 1886 was nowhere

1 Calculated from T.Skinner, *The Directory of Directors*. This table looks at the number of committee members who held directorships at five-yearly intervals. The figures for 1865 and 1870 are estimates.

2 Percentage of the committee of that year holding directorships.

near the level that he indicates.¹ Nevertheless, as will be seen, the relative decline in the numbers of aristocrats is in tune with the expansion of the club and its importance as part of the building of a new social fabric, especially when it is considered that they seem to have held their power within the organisation of cricket.

(d) Conclusion

Taken as a whole, these indicators provide a conflicting picture although some consistent trends are subsumed within the data. As in the rest of society, business, professions and industry were becoming more important. Yet, contrary to previous assessments, the number of titled committee members increased over the period, while there remained a large portion of the committee drawn from the landowning class, among whom were some of the greatest in the British Isles. At the same time, while there were undoubtedly some committee members who could be ambiguously placed within the so-called middle class, the majority were drawn from the upper-sections of what might be termed the dominant class. By birth, education, ownership of property, they were drawn from what has been called Society and consequently, because it is necessary to understand the expansion of the club in terms of the expansion of Society, it is necessary to see the committee as a focal point in the creation and consolidation of the club and as an integral part of this process. While it might be argued that the Marylebone CC absorbed middle-class cricket administrators and supporters as members,² it certainly cannot be argued that the same process was occurring at the level of the committee. As the committee was the forum that controlled the club, as well as

1 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.134-5. These figures are repeated by: Holt, *Sport and the British*, p.112; and, Beckett, *The Aristocracy in England*, p.347. Brookes never sets his criteria for what he considers an aristocrat. Neither does he consider the possibility of extended kinship into the aristocracy or gentry. Therefore it is very hard to tell whether he is counting only those who have a major title, or whether he includes individuals who are younger sons of aristocrats. There is also an argument for extending the category to those who married into the aristocracy. Terms will be defined below. Of course, it is possible that the figures derived from Harris and Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the M.C.C.*, are inaccurate, and that Brookes had access to a source that was more accurate. However, if Table 3.1 is referred to it will be seen that the expansion of such an exclusive club at the speed that Brookes' data indicates is unlikely. Equally, it has to be remembered that Harris was on the spot, and in writing the book as a committee member of the Marylebone CC had access to all the records. Brookes error therefore seems to have been in the transcription of his data. It is worth noting that this has led to slight inaccuracies being reproduced by the writers of more general histories cited above.

2 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.127-8. In fact, Brookes mistakes membership of the Marylebone CC as incorporation into the ruling élite of cricket. He says that faced 'with the choice of removing the MCC or becoming a member of it, the majority of self-proclaimed reformers were so helplessly confused that they did nothing, while the astute few were content to hedge their bets'. Certainly the self-proclaimed reformers never managed to become part of the committee. The committee chose to induct socially acceptable amateurs from the counties who already happened to be members of the club, rather than incorporating reformers into the committee.

making decisions on cricket policy, Brookes' line of argument is shown to be untenable. Indeed there is evidence that the committee functioned as an extended kinship group, which meant that the club was, to all intents and purposes, ruled by a self-perpetuating oligarchy, who admitted and excluded who they liked. It was rule by clique that made the club function as a the law-maker of cricket and enabled it to gain a degree of control over first-class cricket. It was also rule by clique that perpetuated and consolidated the newly created 'traditions' surrounding the Marylebone CC.

Table 3.7a: Landowners by Bateman's classes by five-yearly intervals¹

Class	1860	1865	1870	1875	1880	1885	Total
I		1	1	1	1		4
II	1					2	3
III	4	3	4	2	3	4	20
IV	1	1	5	6	6	3	22
V		2	2	3		1	8
VI	4	3	1		2	2	12
VII	3	2	2	3	2	4	16
Total ²	13	12	15	15	14	16	85
Com. ³	16	17	22	23	24	24	126
% ⁴	81.3	70.6	68.2	65.2	58.3	66.7	68.4

Key (all figures £/Per annum): I = 100,000+; II= 50-100,000; III= 20-50,000; IV= 10-20,000; V= 6-10,000; VI= 3-6,000; VII= 3000+ (but >3000 acres) and/or 2-3000.

¹ Bateman had 6 different classifications for the great landowners of Britain. These he defined as being those 'of her majesty's subjects as possess 3000 acres rented at 3000 L. per annum and upwards'. To these he added what was in effect a seventh class, those who owned less than 3000 acres at an income over 3000L., and those who owned more than the requisite 3000 acres but gained less than 3000L. income from this land. The distribution of these classes was: I = Those who had a landed income of £100,000 p.a. or above (15 people in total); II = Those earning £50-100,000 p.a. (51); III = Incomes between £20-50,000 p.a.(259); IV = £10-20,000 p.a. (541); V = £6-10,000 p.a. (702); VI = £3-6,000 p.a. (932). In total this equalled 2,500 people. To this he added the 1,320 people who owned £2-3,000 worth of land, or under 3000 acres at over £3000, J.Bateman, *The Great Landowners*, p.496. I have added to this class, anyone who had been included in the contemporary edition of *Burke's Landed Gentry*. My assessment has been slightly looser, in the sense that I included those closely related to a major landholder, i.e. brother/son, under the property assessment of the relation who held the property. This is because the immediate relation would definitely have been regarded as someone of similar status to the major property holder. If they were a more distant relation, i.e. cousin/uncle, then they are placed in classification VII, unless they held property in their own right. These classifications are not a complete indicator of status within the landowning classes, as it has to be remembered that under these terms Queen Victoria apparently merely rated a classification of IV, while the HRH the Duke of Cambridge did not even make classification VII. This demonstrates that the really important issue is not landholdings themselves, but the combination of wealth and status within the dominant class. Nevertheless this is a relevant exercise because it demonstrates the homogeneity of the committee as members of a landowning élite at the beginning of the period and demonstrates that by the end there had been admitted more members of what is traditionally thought of as the upper-middle classes.

² Total number of those from the landowning class on the committee of that year.

³ Total number on the committee.

⁴ Percentage of members of the landowning class on the committee of that year.

Table 3.7.a (cont)

Class	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910	1914	Total
I	1		1	1	1	3	7
II	2	2	1	1	2	2	10
III	5	4	3	3	7	2	24
IV	2	1	2				5
V	1	3		1	2	3	10
VI				1			1
VII	3	4	3	2	2	1	16
Total	14	14	10	9	14	11	72
Com.	24	23	22	22	22	22	135
%	58.3	60.9	45.5	40.9	63.6	50	53.3

Key (all figures £/Per annum): I = 100,000+; II= 50-100,000; III= 20-50,000; IV= 10-20,000; V= 6-10,000; VI= 3-6,000; VII= 3000+ (but >3000 acres) and/or 2-3000.

Table 3.7b: Summary of data

Class	Total	% ₁	Av. ₂
I	11	7.0	0.9
II	13	8.3	1.1
III	44	28.0	3.7
IV	27	17.2	2.3
V	18	11.5	1.5
VI	13	8.3	1.1
VII	31	19.7	2.6
Total	157	60.2	13.1
Comm.	261	100.0	21.8

Key (all figures £/Per annum): I = 100,000+; II= 50-100,000; III= 20-50,000; IV= 10-20,000; V= 6-10,000; VI= 3-6,000; VII= 3000+ (but >3000 acres) and/or 2-3000.

Source: Bateman's Great Landowners, Burke's Landed Gentry.

1 Percentage of each classification of the total number of landowners.

2 Average number of each classification on each committee of the selected years, i.e. 11 members in classification I on 12 selected years, means that on each of the selected years 0.9 (11/12=0.9)

Table 3.8: Titles at five-yearly intervals.

Year	Aristocrat ¹	Baronet	Hon. ²	Knight
1860	4	0	3	0
1865	5	0	2	0
1870	6	1	3	1
1875	3	1	2	1
1880	5	1	2	0
1885	7	0	2	1
1890	7	0	3	1
1895	6	1	1	1
1900	4	0	2	1
1905	6	1	1	0
1910	11	0	1	0
1914	10	0	2	0
Total	74	5	24	6
%	28.4	1.9	9.2	2.3

Source: Harris, Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC* ; Burke's *Peerage* ; Burke's *Landed Gentry*.

Kinship and Rule by clique.

The committee was indeed a closely knit body, not just in class terms, but also on a much deeper level. Access to the committee was more or less by invitation as confirmed by Lord Hawke. Consequently, those most likely to gain admittance were not only connected by cricketing ties, but would often be personal friends of committee members, or part of the old school tie network. On top of that there were frequent cases of fathers, sons and brothers, as well as people related through marriage serving on the committee. Most famous of all these were obviously Lord Bessborough (Fred Ponsonby) and Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane. But there were many others including: the Hon. Robert Grimston and his brother the 2nd Earl of Verulam; the Walker brothers; the 4th Earl of Winterton and his son; the 5th Baron Lyttelton and his brother, the Hon. Alfred; and, the 6th Duke of Buccleuch and his son the Earl of Dalkeith. There were other instances where committee members were related by marriage, an unsurprising feature when one considers the numbers of the aristocracy that served on the committee.³ These familial ties demonstrate the homogeneity of the committee as a

¹ All those with the titles: Baron; Earl; Duke; Lord; Marquess; and Viscount.

² Those who used the title Hon. as a direct result of their relationship to an aristocrat. This meant that they were the son or brother of a nobleman. If they were the first in line to the title this was occasionally the title they would use before inheriting the title, although Viscount was more common. If they were a younger son then they remained Hon. for their life. In the case of those who had both the title of Honourable and had also been knighted, as with the Hon. Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, the person in question is merely entered under the Hon. column.

³ There were many instances of this. For instance, Lord George Hamilton, ⁷resident in 1881, married the youngest daughter of the 3rd Earl of Harewood, while 3rd Baron Wenlock, ⁷resident in 1885,

group and indicate why it was easy for the committee to be controlled by what was, in effect, a small clique of people related by friendship, education and class background.

Over this period there were two groups that were important in the control of the Marylebone committee. One superseded the other in the latter years of this period. The first group consisted of the Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, the Hon. F. Ponsonby (6th Earl of Bessborough), Hon. R. Grimston, W. Nicholson, R. J. P. Broughton and those that surrounded them, including the Walker's of Southgate and A. J. Webbe. It was rare that more than one of these was not present at committee meetings in the years between 1860 and 1895 and they inhabited Lord's on almost all match days during the summer. Thus in 1882 we find in the minutes:

G. Ulyett having expressed a wish to make a statement before the committee of the MCC relating to the so called cricket scandal and he (Ulyett) having to go out in the field at once, those of the committee who could be found viz. Hon. Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, Hon. R. Grimston, V. E. Walker, Capt. W. E. Denison and H. Perkins, met in the secretary's private room.¹

If there was a decision to be made then one of these men would be around to make it.

The major figures of this group had two things in common. Firstly they were all born in the pre-Victorian era (the oldest of them, Fred Ponsonby, was born in the same year as the battle of Waterloo). Secondly, they were all Harrovians and often loyal to the school to the point of obsession. Ponsonby and Grimston were remembered with affection for many years as the coaches of the Harrow School Eleven.² Nicholson

married the eldest daughter of the 4th Earl of Harewood. Sir William Hart-Dyke, resident in 1880, married the eldest daughter of the 7th Earl of Sandwich, who was president in 1866. Sir C. E. Boyle, on the committee between 1876 and 1889, was brother-in-law of the 3rd Earl of Cawdor, who served as president in 1908. Cawdor was himself related by marriage to two former presidents. The 9th Duke of Devonshire, president in 1912, was the son-in-law of the 5th Marquis of Lansdowne, the president of 1869 and a former viceroy of India. The 2nd Baron Belper, president in 1882, and the 6th Earl of Dartmouth, president in 1893, married sisters (daughters of the 2nd Earl of Leicester, who had himself been a president in 1848, and had served on the committee until 1861). More spectacularly, the 5th Marquis of Lansdowne, the 5th Earl of Winterton, president in 1884, and the 6th Duke of Buccleuch, president in 1888, all married daughters of the 1st Duke of Abercorn. Meanwhile, the 3rd Earl of Lichfield, president in 1897, was the son of another daughter of the 1st Duke of Abercorn. Not surprisingly, the 2nd Duke of Abercorn, served as president in 1874 before succeeding to the title. He married a daughter of the 1st Earl of Howe and was thus related to the president of 1901, the 4th Earl of Howe. Believe it or not, this kinship group could be expanded even further, but as this thesis is not overly concerned with the finer workings of genealogy there seems little point!

1 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, May 29th 1882.

2 When they died they were both eulogised by schoolmaster/doggerel merchant E. E. Bowen. Of the two he said: 'One friend and he, when thrills of warmer spring/
Lent health and voice to boyish frame and tongue,
Stood side by side, or parted but to bring/
Their treasured counsel to the scattering throng,
Tory and Whig, stout wills, and courtly grace/
One strong for strife, one ignorant of foe;
Both high of heart, and matched in honour's race;
And in what else united? Ah we know'. From L. Frewin, *The*

purchased playing fields for the school in the 1890s for the promotion of games. They were all friends whose major bond was their school.¹ This was cemented by their love of cricket, their membership of the MCC and the cricket club that they themselves founded, the exclusive I Zingari. While they had mixed political beliefs, they were definitely upholders of the establishment and absolute social conservatives.

Their satellites were generally younger, but shared many similarities. The most famous of these were the Walkers, who resided as country squires at Southgate in Middlesex. They were cricket socialites, founders of Middlesex County Cricket Club and were admired throughout the cricketing world. The two most famous of the seven brothers were V.E. and I.D. V.E. was one of the greatest all-rounders of his day while I.D. was yet another pillar of Harrow school. He succeeded Ponsonby and Grimston as coach of the eleven and he ran, for many years, the prestigious old boy's club, the Harrow Wanderers. When he died in 1898 he was eulogised by the *Harrovian* and his tomb-stone was inscribed with an epitaph composed by E.E.Bowen.² A friend of I.D. and constant companion was the Middlesex cricketer A.J.Webbe, another Harrovian, who was described as having 'no profession' in the *Harrow School Register*. Frequently I.D. and Webbe would embark on fishing trips to Ireland together. He too was part of the clique and he served on the MCC committee for twenty years all told during these years. As a whole, this group represented attitudes which would best be described as early to mid-Victorian, pre-dating the one nation conservatism and the social imperialism of the post-Disraeli era. Although many of them were involved in a diverse range of activities, from law and government administration, to business and brewing, they all adhered to a central but parochial view of cricket which looked more to the insular green fields of Lord's, their beloved public school and the two universities, rather than to the outside world.

There was a change in the 1890s. By this time Lords Harris and Hawke had matured and were rapidly becoming the controlling voices of Lord's. They too were surrounded by a group of younger men including P.F.Warner, H.D.G.Leveson-

Poetry of Cricket, (Macdonald, London 1964), p.296. They were presumably 'united' in their love of cricket. A less sentimental ballad which was apparently a Harrow standard went: 'Old Damon and old Pythias/ Were always found together:/ You never saw those chums apart/ In smooth or stormy weather./ But Ponsonby and Grimston/ Triumphantly compare/ With that somewhat sentimental/ superannuated pair.' from Lord C.J.F.Russell, *Some Recollections of Cricket*, (H.G.Fisher, Woburn 1879), no page number.

¹ Bessborough was quoted as saying in 1893: 'No Harrovian severs his connection with the school if he can help it. In the summer I go there frequently, for apart from anything else the place is so healthy. I.D.Walker also goes constantly and acts as umpire in the boys' games.' W.A.Bettesworth, *Chats on the Cricket Field*, (Merrit and Hatcher, London n.d.), p.214. The interview was in 1893, not long before Bessborough died. The date of publication of the book was around 1910-11.

² W.A.Bettesworth, *The Walkers of Southgate*, (Methuen, London 1900), pp.89-92.

Gower and the Hon.F.S.Jackson. Harris and Hawke were both Etonians and both of them had been to Cambridge. Harris was the link between the two groups. He had been a personal friend of the Walkers and had toured Australia in 1879 with Webbe and others. Harris was the classic example of a social conservative. He was a passionate believer in One-Nation Toryism and was prepared to speak about cricket, society and the empire up and down the country, in schools, working men's clubs and other institutions. For a time he was president of the Primrose League and he was even quoted as distorting a Marxist maxim by stating that there should not be too many restrictions on professional cricketers because he could not support 'anything that had any suspicion of interfering with a working man from selling that which was his property - his labour'.¹ He was a daunting figure, capable of imposing his will whenever he felt necessary, unless, as occasionally happened, a man of equal power and status stood up to him.² During the 1880s he carried out what was almost a one man crusade to stamp out 'unfair' bowling (i.e.throwing), while he also attempted to lay down the laws on county qualifications for cricketers. By the beginning of the twentieth century he had become an immensely powerful figure, which occasionally caused conflict when someone went against him. Harris's effect on cricket has ^{been} generally reckoned to be profound and, as Moorhouse has pointed out, his spirit still seems to stalk the corridors of Lord's. This is certainly true when you wander behind the pavilion into the Harris Memorial Garden.³

Hawke was from a similar political stable, although he was not as overtly political as Harris. Nonetheless, like Harris he belonged to the Carlton Club and he still represented the newer Toryism and the break in political consensus that had occurred after 1885. Hawke was a fascinating character whose main claim to fame lies in the fact that he captained Yorkshire during what was undoubtedly the golden age of the county. He styled himself a friend of the professional cricketer, which he was in his own

1 Sissons, *The Players*, p.88.

2 Warner recounts a story in, *Lord's 1787-1945*, p.138, which demonstrates a clash of wills between Harris and Lord Alverstone, who at the time was Lord Chief Justice, on the Marylebone CC committee. Warner says that the incident was the only 'breeze' that occurred while he sat on the committee: 'Lord Harris made a proposal which did not appeal to Lord Alverstone, who had just come from presiding...at a famous murder trial. He looked rather worn out, and when he was tired he had a habit of rubbing his face and forehead with his right hand. After a more than usually vigorous rub he replied, "I think I ought to say at once that I shall oppose that tooth and nail". For a few moments the atmosphere was glacial, with two strong men in opposite camps, but it soon passed, and at the end of the meeting I heard Lord Alverstone remark, "George was very testy to-day".'

3 G.Moorhouse, *Lord's*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1983),pp. 42-3. For a general biography of Harris, see J.D.Coldham, *Lord Harris*, (George Allen and Unwin, London 1983). For a good summary of Harris, his social background and his impact on professional cricketers, see, Sissons, *The Players*, pp.86-91.

particular way. In fact, he developed a paternalist system based on rewards and punishment that became something of a model for other county captains. By the beginning of the new century he was a regular member of the Board of Control for test matches, as well as the all important cricket sub-committee at Lord's. Although he was by no means as important a figure as Harris in terms of the Marylebone CC and the control of cricket, he was still an important figure, particularly as ^{it was} he, rather than the aloof Harris, who befriended the younger members of the group.¹ Hawke was a personal friend of Jackson and Warner, for whom he was best man, and Leveson-Gower, who was affectionately referred to as 'Shrimp' throughout Hawke's ghosted biography.² It is significant that all of these followers were Conservatives, ardent believers in the empire and supreme lovers of the Marylebone CC. Both Warner and Leveson-Gower were to become powerful figures within the club.³ In the following chapter the significance of this change in personnel within the dominant clique will be discussed in terms of the Marylebone CC's control of cricket.

1 For a lively assessment of Hawke see Birley, *The Willow Wand*, pp.104-10. This assessment is regarded in many cricketing circles as being close to blasphemy, but it loses nothing in truth for that. The editor of the *Journal of the Cricket Society*, Vol.9, no.4, (1980), p.48, was upset by Birley's examination of Hawke's character, particularly as Birley was highly facetious about *Recollections and Reminiscences*, which he described as 'amongst one of the least modest books ever put together'. It was pointed out that the book had actually been ghosted by Sir Home Gordon which to this particular reader seems irrelevant. There is no doubt that voice was that of Hawke, even if the writing was not.

2 See Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*.

3 For a very good biography of Warner, see G.Howat, *Plum Warner*. It is a fine demonstration of the type of class background from which Warner originated. At the same time it displays the relationship that Warner had with Harris, whom he held in awe (p.5), and Hawke, who apparently, along with Alfred Lyttelton, persuaded Warner that he should commit himself to cricket rather than the bar (p.25).

CHAPTER 4. THE PARLIAMENT HOUSE OF CRICKET: THE MARYLEBONE CC AND THE CONTROL OF DOMESTIC AND IMPERIAL CRICKET

I

Informal bonds: the sinews of power

The Marylebone CC built upon its reputation as the 'House of Lord's of Cricket' to become not just the law-makers of the game, but the rulers. From 1864, when the position of the club was jeopardised by a coalition of interest groups which sought to discredit it, until the 1890s, the committee built up an informal network, which controlled English first-class cricket as an extension of the old school-tie network. By the 1880s, the majority of the committee members had significant connections with the major counties, enabling them to control by persuasion bodies that had no real obligations to the club. The 1890s saw the Marylebone CC virtually develop an entire administration for the game of cricket centred within the confines of Lord's. This was completed in the first decade of the new century with the creation of an advisory council on which the counties sat. Parallel to these developments came the involvement of the club in international cricket, first by setting up a selection board in 1898 to regulate home test matches, then by agreeing to organise tours to the empire, taking over a role that had previously been reserved for entrepreneurs and zealous gentlemen.

By 1914, Lord Harris, looking through rose-tinted spectacles, was able to complete the edifice of the myth¹ of Marylebone CC's superiority in the past. Writing in *Lord's and the MCC*, he commented:

Throughout its existence the Marylebone CC has been the recognized head of the cricketing world. During that period the game has undergone many alterations and improvements, and the club itself has changed from an autocratic into a democratic body; but this notwithstanding, the position of the Marylebone CC has never been seriously challenged, and this fact testifies that the influence it has exerted has invariably been for the good. Its laws are accepted in all countries where the game is played, and everywhere its decisions on cricket matters are accepted as final; yet it has never attempted to enforce its authority, and it holds its position by consent of all clubs in Great Britain and its ruling bodies in all parts of the world... It acts as a kind of agent for the Australian, South African and other ruling bodies; it does even more for the counties both first and second-class.¹

Harris was exaggerating. The Marylebone CC may have been perceived by the beginning of the war as the be-all-and-end-all of cricket, but it was, in terms of

¹ Harris and Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*, pp.235-6.

organising cricket outside of the first-class sphere relatively unimportant. Nevertheless, this should not lead us to believe that the club had limited importance. The social status of the Marylebone CC ensured that it had a special place in the ideology of cricket and the social and, indeed, the political life of the English dominant class. As cricket was a pillar of Anglo-Saxon belief, so the Marylebone CC was the foundation of that pillar. This was not least the product of those ideologues who had served on the committee and promoted the importance of the club. This chapter examines the creation of the myth of the Marylebone CC and examines how the mythology was used to legitimize the extension of Marylebone power throughout first class cricket.

It was misleading of Harris to say that the Marylebone CC held its position as the most important body in cricket through consent, because this suggests that the club governed cricket with effortless ease. The Marylebone CC was able to exercise control by acting with the consent of most clubs. It was able to gain this consent because it had connections with them. At the same time these connections were not brought about by assimilating the middle-class reformers as posited by Brookes.¹ The way in which the system developed was much more complicated than that. Indeed, what occurred was that the committee built up an informal network by recruiting to its ranks members of the club who had cricketing or organisational links with county clubs and the universities. Thus the Marylebone CC became, by stages, an informal, but powerful forum for first-class cricket, utilising a system much beloved by the dominant class: a network of contacts that acted like an extended kinship group i.e. the old school-tie.² Because the collective class position of this group was located within the dominant class they acted in the interests of the dominant class. They supported the schools and universities, promoted the idea of county cricket, disciplined, punished and rewarded professionals, protected the status of paid amateurs and eventually built links into the Empire. At the same time, after the 1890s when Harris had attained a degree of eminence within the club, they created a whole infrastructure of organisation for county and test cricket that stood almost until the present day.

At first sight, connections between the club and the counties appear to be vague, and it is evident that the dominant class ploy of appealing to the better senses and good-

1 Ch.3 above.

2 Bowen, *Cricket*, p.102, asserts that the increase in membership brought in members of other important cricket clubs from all over the country. He believes that this enabled information to pass more easily between the Marylebone CC and these organisations. Consequently 'the committee members could not sit by themselves isolated from opinion, for they encountered it wherever they went in the pavilion...' This idea has been reiterated by Holt, *Sport and the British*, p.112. Bowen was actually quite near the mark in this instance, and in so doing may have given Brookes his idea of the assimilation of middle-class reformers. What is being argued here however, is that a network was formed on the committee, which acted as a far more efficient forum than might be imagined.

will of the first-class counties was stressed over direct interference. Therefore in 1883, when considering the question of illegal bowling actions, the committee expressed 'hope for the support of other clubs throughout the country'.¹ However on closer inspection it appears that the committee really had considerable links with most of the counties and both the universities. These connections were initially developed in the early part of this period, for although in 1860 county cricket was an ill-formed beast there were still considerable links between the club and some of the counties. For example, Frederick Ponsonby was highly connected with the Surrey CCC. Another member of the committee in this early period, the 4th Earl of Winterton, was connected with the Sussex CCC, while the Walkers of Southgate, founders of the Middlesex CCC, were present on the committee from a very early stage. There were others who were able to represent the interests of the universities, including C.J.B.Marsham. This gave the Marylebone Club and the counties a front on which to unite against the hated professional teams.

Over the years, as the movement for county cricket gained strength, so too did the numbers on the committee who could be said to be delegates for their counties. By 1883, the championship was still being played on a disorganised basis. The press were the arbiters of the game, deciding who had actually won the title and fixtures were arranged by a meeting of the county secretaries.² Because it alone possessed an organisational framework of some sophistication the Marylebone Committee was almost a representative body. On the committee, in that year, were: A.N.Hornby, member of Lancashire CCC and on its committee; V.E.Walker, founder and vice-president of Middlesex CCC; Lord Harris, the life and soul of Kent CCC; the Earl of Bessborough, perpetual member of Surrey CCC; the 2nd Baron Belper, late president of Nottinghamshire CCC and constant supporter of the club; C.J.B.Marsham, pillar of Oxford University CC and an original member of the Harlequins; and the Rev.A.R.Ward, outstanding figure in Cambridge University cricket, and son of an old grandee of Lord's, William Ward. Obviously some counties were not represented, in this case Yorkshire and Sussex, but even so there were many past members of the committee and presidents who were connected with Yorkshire (and in the near future it would have Lord Hawke to represent its interests), while as for Sussex, Lord Sheffield, greatest patron of that club, was a member of the Marylebone CC and moved within the same circles, both cricketing and social, as many of the influential members of the committee.

¹ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, Annual report 1883.

² The meeting of the secretaries was founded in 1882.

A further example of these inter-connections can be seen in a letter sent to the Marylebone CC in May 1894 asking for several counties to be given first-class status. The letter was signed by Hawke, J. Shuter, S.M.J. Woods, J.A. Dixon, F. Marchant, W.L. Murdoch, A.J. Webbe, A.N. Hornby and W.G. Grace.¹ Only Woods, Dixon, Murdoch and Grace did not serve at one time or another on the committee. However Grace was an influential figure and by this time had achieved Grand Old Man status, even if he had not quite reached the apotheosis of 1895. The others were not insignificant cricketers and they were all members of Marylebone CC. Likewise, on the first Board of Control for test matches in England, the six members elected from the counties were Lord Hawke, A.J. Webbe, W.G. Grace, Sir R. Webster Q.C. (later created Lord Alverstone), C.E. Green and A.N. Hornby.² All of these men were members of the club and only Grace had no connections with the committee.

These links gave the Marylebone CC considerable, if informal, influence in the counties and beyond. Initially the interests of the club had been confined to the universities and the great public schools. Now, with an expansion in the first class game it had broadened its outlook to include first-class counties, minor counties and many of the newer public schools. This breadth may well have resulted in an attempt by the committee to co-opt members from a wider social background, although, as can be seen from the previous chapter, this was limited in scope. Whatever the intention, the committee served and continued to serve the interests of their class in the cricketing sphere, thus building a concrete basis for the invented tradition of the club. The committee now functioned like other sections of the dominant class, recruiting from a narrow base of people it regarded as both socially acceptable and worthy cricketing authorities, to act as informal rulers, on a body that was unelected and seemed to draw its powers as much by precedence as anything else. By 1900 the Marylebone CC was functioning in a way that would be approved by all true-blue-blooded dominant class Englishmen.

It is more difficult to perceive the manner in which they gained the consent of the ruling bodies in other parts of the Empire. Certainly Lord Harris exaggerated when he said that the laws were accepted in all countries. At the most extreme, in the South Pacific, this does not even contain an atom of truth. In these areas, and particularly in Samoa where the game was so popular and disruptive to everyday life that it had to be proscribed by law, cricket was assimilated into the traditional framework of society.³ Elsewhere variations were a common occurrence, especially in Australia, and these

¹ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 2 May 1894.

² *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 11 Oct 1898.

³ Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, pp.394-8.

were usually dictated by local conditions and customs. Nevertheless, after 1890 the Marylebone CC network did extend into the Empire. For example, when Harris returned from his stint as Governor of Bombay, he was prepared to promote the interests of the Parsees. Australia was represented by several different people, including the 7th Earl of Jersey, who had served as Governor General in New South Wales. The committee was also in constant contact with different interest groups in Australia who looked to them for guidance. When Australian XIs visited in the late 1890s, the advice of Major Wardill, secretary of the Melbourne CC, was frequently asked. The West Indies, although a disparate group of islands, had Plum Warner, who was a native Trinidadian, while contacts were made all over the world by Warner and Hawke. Thus the influence of the committee could extend even beyond the shores of the British Isles.¹

II

The Marylebone CC and domestic cricket

Undoubtedly, these informal bonds were the sinews of the power of the club, nascent in the early years of this period, emergent in the late 1870s and early 1880s and fully apparent by the turn of the century. It was this created network that enabled the club to build an administration centred within the precincts of Lord's. Thus by 1914, based on the club's own criteria, they had fulfilled and surpassed the aims laid down by Fitzgerald in 1870:

To preserve the game from all abuses, to foster a healthy emulation in our schools and universities, and to inculcate the principles of discipline, good temper, and sobriety, were the real aim and end of the Marylebone Club.²

While some may have argued that the club was not fulfilling this mission in 1870, few suggested that Marylebone was not acting in this way in the early twentieth. What enabled the club to build up its network and then go on to become the key institution in the organisation of cricket, was the same structure that had invented its tradition. The power network was therefore based upon: the education of the members of the club and their connections with Eton and Harrow, and Oxford and Cambridge; the continuing myth of the omnipotence of the club through history, which created the all-important (if

¹ There were, of course, other reasons why Marylebone's dictats might be accepted in the Empire. The broad acceptance of the game in its British form potentially gave legitimization to colonial cricket clubs and authorities, which existed in societies where aping customs of 'Home' was the order of the day. By adopting the Marylebone code they were affirming their belief in the paramountcy of the mother country.

² *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 4 May 1870.

bogus) precedents for cricket control; and the extent to which the powers-that-be at Lord's were prepared to support the amateur code against the professionals. At the same time, increased intervention after 1890 by the Marylebone CC in the organisation of the County Championship was undoubtedly the result of a change in composition of the committee. Thus, on the one hand, the Marylebone CC had actively built its reputation upon invented tradition, while on the other, it was able to utilise this tradition when a change in its dominant clique occurred.

'Our Schools and universities': The base of the Myth and the backbone of power

By 'our schools' Fitzgerald meant specifically public schools and therefore, whether intentionally or not, 'our' signified class rather than country. As was seen in chapter 2, the Marylebone CC had significant connections with the two 'great' public schools, Eton and Harrow, as well as the traditional universities. The public school match was regarded as one of the highlights of the year, for both Society and the Marylebone club, similarly the University match. As stated, the growth in the club was correlated with the increased status attached to these two sporting occasions in the London Society calendar.¹ The matches seemed to have totemic significance for the club, occasions when nostalgia and pride in the old school or university took on larger dimensions, with the members split into two opposing camps, almost as antagonistic for the few days of their duration as Rangers and Celtic fans.²

However, the club's connections with the public schools and universities went much deeper than this. They saw themselves as promoters of public school and university cricket, sending teams to play the schools, recruiting from them and even helping them financially, as was the case with the universities who received a donation

1 While the Eton V. Harrow match was an occasion for displaying loyalties among club members, as well as a gathering of society, there were many who were dismayed by the fashionable element believing that cricket was too important to be treated as a fashion parade. One such critic was committee member, R.D.Walker, 'Eton and Harrow Match', p.392, 'fully one third of those who attend...not only do not look at the cricket, but absolutely take no interest in it'. Such complaints were very common, and usually aimed at the women, who were, of course, arbiters of fashion. However, one should not take too much notice of these remarks, as they are usually attempts by the cognoscenti of cricket to demonstrate that they are different to the rabble of Society. The fact remains that the material fortunes of the club were significantly built upon the success of the Society games.

2 This could cause heated exchanges, not just among the paying spectators. At the university game during the 1890s there were two instances of crowd 'trouble' in the pavilion, no less, which were the result of conduct on the field. On one of these, the Cambridge captain instructed his bowler to send three balls straight to the boundary in order to avoid having to enforce what was then a compulsory follow-on. W.Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, p.269; also see Vamplew, 'Sports crowds disorder in Britain, 1870-1914' in *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.7, No.1,(1980), pp.8-9. One cricket writer actually believed that one of the two instances was the worst instance of crowd trouble he had ever seen at a cricket match, W.J.Ford, 'Thoughts on spectators', in *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.VIII, (1899), p.527.

every season from the club. Most important of all these functions was sending teams to play the schools. It is no coincidence that the culmination of *Tom Brown's Schooldays* is a match between Rugby School and the club. For Rugby, it was the highlight of the year in terms of cricket, the most prestigious match of all. As the public school system expanded, and as the club grew, it sent out teams to the schools as a recognition of the importance of school cricket. Undoubtedly, in most of these places the Marylebone match would have been the most important of the year. It is arguable that these matches derived their importance from the creation of mythology, the invention of tradition. *Tom Brown's Schooldays* was an important landmark in the invention of Public School tradition,¹ and the fact that the denouement of the book saw the appearance of the Marylebone club, meant that such a game became ingrained in the ideology of public school education. Every school, had to have its Marylebone match, as it had to have a school bully, tuck shop and great headmaster. It is impossible to ascertain the level of prestige that this earned the club, although it would be foolish to underestimate the gain given the importance attached to sport in the nineteenth century public school.

On the ideological level, the connections between the Marylebone CC and the schools was important, but on the concrete level the importance was more pronounced. The Marylebone CC was able to forge links with schools, keeping an eye open for the best amateur talent, establishing itself as the club to join if you happened to be a public schoolboy and a cricketer. By consolidating this bond, the club was active in creating the network by which it was able to control and influence cricket. This is especially the case if one considers that county cricket was controlled by amateur cricketers or administrators allied to the amateur interest. A bond that was forged early based upon the social importance of the Marylebone club could reach fruition at the level of county administration. The ideals of service to class and country implanted at school matured on the cricketing level into the ideal of service to the game under a hierarchy of which the Marylebone CC was head. 'Our schools' were not only the source of membership of the club, they were also the backbone of power and influence.

1 A tradition that was consolidated in a whole range of fiction dealt with in Mangan, *Athleticism In the Victorian and Edwardian Public Schools*, chs. 7-8. Also see J.Springhall, 'Building character in the British boy: the attempt to extend Christian Manliness to working-class adolescents, 1880-1914', in Mangan and Walvin (eds.), *Manliness and Morality*, 1800-1940. This literary genre always placed a great emphasis on the Athletic side of school life. Some, like Desmond Coke, *Bending of a Twig*, (Oxford University Press, London 1920 - 1st edn. 1906), looked at rowing, while others, like P.G.Wodehouse in the Mike stories published in *The Captain*, took cricket as their example. All were influenced by Thomas Hughes's book, even if they attempted to refute parts of the myth. Springhall comments that in Juvenile literature in the post-1880 period 'Tom Brown was, ultimately, still their model but not the 'muscular Christian' who knelt down to say his prayers in a hostile boys' dormitory to win the respect of Dr.Arnold, more the manly hero of the cricket and football fields', see 'Building character in the British boy', p.63.

The power of the Marylebone CC was not just built on the traditions and contacts with public schools and university. It was also based upon the constitutional chestnut of precedence, or what one writer called 'the incalculable advantage of possessing a history'.¹ Precedence plays a very important part in dominant class tradition, giving it the power to uphold laws and rule through parliament. In cricket the use of precedence was no different, supposedly giving the club the right to control the game. Precedence too has become a very important part of the myth. Thus Lewis writes about the Marylebone CC that 'even before they put bat to ball on Lord's ground, the members of the Marylebone club wrote a new code of laws for cricket: and from the start they presumed complete authority'.² There is a little truth in this statement. The social composition of the club did give it a presumption of authority over the game of cricket and continued to do so until after the Second World War. Equally, the origins of the club, rooted in Hambledon and more especially in the Star and Garter Tavern, Pall Mall, gave it the prestige to rule. It was at the Star and Garter that the Jockey Club was formed in the middle of the century; an organisation that promptly took control of horse-racing. In later years the Marylebone CC was often compared with the Jockey Club.³

There are, however, striking distinctions between the two institutions. The Jockey Club was set up to regulate a sport. There is little or no evidence to suggest that the main intention of the founding of the Marylebone CC was to dominate cricket country-wide. Likewise the Marylebone CC was a playing club, where the members were primarily concerned with providing exercise for themselves rather than in regulating their game, as seemed to be the sole purpose of the Jockey Club. There must be considerable doubt as to the importance of the Marylebone CC as legislator for the game of cricket during the early years of the club's existence. When the Marylebone CC published its 1787 edition of the laws they were merely revising earlier versions. Indeed, in all but the smallest detail, the 1787 laws are no different to those published by the 'Gentlemen of the Star and Garter' in 1784. In fact there was even considerable overlap between the two groups of legislators, which might suggest that Marylebone CC was founded in all but name at an earlier date.⁴ Furthermore earlier sets of laws

1 P.C.W.Trevor, *With the MCC in Australia*, (Alston Rivers, London 1908), p.247.

2 Lewis, *Double Century*, p.29.

3 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.67-70 examines the origins of the Marylebone Club. His genealogy of the club extends from the Je-ne-sais-quoi club, through the Star and Garter, to the White Conduit club, which was the immediate predecessor of the Marylebone. It appears that this account was largely taken from Warner, *Lord's, 1787-1945*, pp.17-18.

4 Lewis, *Double Century*, p.16.

exist and they are not vastly different to those of 1784.¹ It is perfectly possible that in all cases it was custom that was being recorded rather than any revolutionary pronouncements about the way in which the game was to be played. It is also worth considering the possibility that the 1787 laws were laid down principally for the benefit of the members of the club and those who played against them and not for public consumption. It is almost as if the founders of the Marylebone CC were saying 'these are the laws by which we will play, you can take them or leave them'. Certainly they had no power to enforce the new rules and other forms of cricket, both folk and formalised, continued to flourish far and wide across the country.

It is arguable whether the Marylebone CC in the early years was more than an informal gathering of landed gentlemen. Brookes believes that until the 1820s the club had no structure and was loosely based around the activities of the proprietor of Lord's, Thomas Lord himself, and James Dark, his successor.² This is slightly contentious, as this can be no more than supposition, the records of the club prior to 1826 having been destroyed in a fire. However, the theory does paint the picture of a typical pre-industrial sports club/contest, based around the activities of an entrepreneur who often happened to be involved in the drink trade.³ Despite this, he does comment that the rise in importance of the club was contemporaneous with the cricketing activities of Lord Frederick Beauclerk.⁴ Beauclerk was a bombastic autocrat, who virtually shaped the club to his own character. He was not himself above sharp practice and gamesmanship on the cricket field, but he was an ardent stickler for the laws of the game off it. Any man who infringed the laws within sight or sound of Beauclerk was liable to be hounded out of cricket and disputes were referred to Beauclerk himself with an increasing regularity. Beauclerk was an important step in the creation of the myth of the Marylebone CC, as he more or less created the precedence whereby disputes from all over the country were referred to Lord's.⁵ Thus the aristocratic and autocratic tradition of the Marylebone CC was literally created with Beauclerk, but was consolidated at a

1 For development of the laws see Rait-Kerr, *The Laws of Cricket*, pp.3-24. This description is good for the actual details of the development of the code as a set of written laws; however his insistence that first Hambledon and then Marylebone were central administrators is untenable.

2 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.69-75.

3 Brookes, *English Cricket*, p.50; R.W.Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1973), p.41; Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution c1780-c.1880*, p.27. The connection between alcohol and sport and leisure has been well documented by several historians including Malcolmson and Cunningham. Also see Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*, pp.100-1, as well as many other citations, for the importance of drink in popular recreation.

4 Brookes, *English Cricket*, pp.69-70.

5 There are many examples of this in G.B.Buckley, *Fresh Light on Pre-Victorian Cricket*, (Cotterel, Birmingham 1937). See, for example, p.79.

much later date. However, this should not be confused with the club ruling as a central authority. It must be remembered that until much later there was no way in which the Marylebone CC could forcibly exercise its will. There were no formal cricket competitions, no proper definition of first-class status existed, and matches were played hundreds of miles from London in an era when communications, while improving, were still poor. The only power that the Marylebone CC had was influence, an influence which it exerted due to the position of some of its members in society. This was, to say the least, a weak attribute. Because of this powerlessness the Marylebone CC's self-proclaimed role as legislator was easily challenged and, indeed, its inadequate handling of disputes served to illustrate the conservatism and impotence of the self-elected custodians of cricket. At the back of these disputes was the persistent challenge mounted by the professionals against those who regarded themselves as their superiors in the social structure.

'Jaw, jar and discord'.¹ Meeting The challenge of the professionals and the rise of the counties

Between 1815 and 1864 a series of challenges were made by professional cricketers in an effort to control their own cricketing lives. By introducing innovations of technique onto the cricket field and then forming their own elevens, the professionals pushed the game forward into the age of industrialisation and urbanisation. The actions of the professionals led to tensions between them and their supposed social superiors. Disputes followed which questioned the pre-eminence of the Marylebone CC as legislator. The culmination of these challenges occurred in the 1860s and it was necessary for the Marylebone CC to meet the crisis full-on before they could take any steps towards controlling cricket.

The first major challenge to the position of the Marylebone CC as legislator was posed by the invention of round-arm bowling. Previously the bowler delivered the ball under-arm, but since the 1780s various bowlers had experimented with a slinging delivery which meant that the ball could be bowled faster and would achieve substantially more bounce, thus making a batsman's life considerably more uncomfortable. Apparently Tom Walker of Hambledon had first attempted this mode of delivery in the 1780s, but as Nyren said in retrospect 'at that time it was esteemed foul play and so it was decided by a council of the Hambledon club, which was called for the purpose'.² However it was John Willes who brought round-arm bowling into direct

1 Pycroft, *Cricketana*, p.71.

2 Nyren, *The Young Cricketer's Tutor*, p.76. Nyren was writing with a considerable amount of hindsight at the height of the round-arm controversy and therefore it is difficult to assess the reliability of such a statement. Nyren was completely opposed to the introduction of this new method of bowling

confrontation with the old ways. He first bowled round-arm in 1807, but for many years Willes was forced to play the role of prophet without honour in his own land, because, at first, few chose to follow his example. Gradually support and imitation of the new style grew, but as the number of imitators increased so did the opposition of the reactionary masters at Lord's, especially from William Ward, one of the controlling voices of the Marylebone CC. When the laws received one of their perennial services in 1816, Ward deliberately placed the question of round-arm bowling on the agenda and a law was inserted which emphasised the Marylebone CC's support for the traditional under-arm style. This did not stop John Willes and his now more numerous imitators.

The early years of the 1820s were the nexus of the crisis with continuing opposition from the Marylebone CC and continuing resistance from the growing ranks of the round-arm bowlers. In 1822 Willes himself was no-balled by an Marylebone CC umpire for illegal bowling, thus stating clearly the intentions of the club. Nevertheless, the problem for the Marylebone CC was that few people were listening. While Willes retired from the game in a fit of disgust and disillusion after this incident, the style of round-arm was being carried to new heights of perfection by two proponents of the art from Sussex - William Lillywhite and Jem Broadbridge. The controversy even caused division within the club itself, with G.T.Knight approving of the new bowling method, and then going one step further by arranging a series of trial matches to prove his point, while a powerful lobby led by Ward fought a rear-guard action tooth and nail. John Nyren himself argued that he 'should hope that such powerful and efficient members of the Marylebone Club, as Mr.Ward etc. will determine, not only to discountenance, but wholly and finally to suppress it'.¹ But 'wholly and finally' the Marylebone CC were unable to do anything. Lillywhite and Broadbridge continued to bowl unabated, unopposed and very successfully. The men from Sussex called round-arm 'the march of the intellect system' and it was a march with which eventually the Marylebone CC had to step in time. In 1835 the club finally bowed to the pressure that was being placed upon them and they grudgingly legalised round-arm bowling.

Between 1835 and 1864 the Marylebone CC faced several further challenges, which in the end threatened its meagre position of power to the point of extinction. Over the next three decades the rest of the cricketing world moved forward while the Marylebone CC remained static. They were unable to match the popularity of William Clarke's travelling professional team and its off-shoots: the United England and the United South of England Elevens. Professionals, inspired by the entrepreneurial spirit,

and it is not impossible that this elderly and nostalgic man was summoning up false witnesses from his imagination. I have so far been unable to corroborate this story from any other source.

¹ Nyren, *The Young Cricketer's Tutor*, p.76.

were travelling hither and thither and all the Marylebone CC could do was smile weakly. The professionals seemed to be controlling their own destiny.¹ Likewise The club was unable to match the amenities of the Oval Cricket Ground across the river Thames, which for a time threatened Lord's as the centre of cricket in Britain. Lord's suffered from a diabolical playing surface with pathetic accommodation both for those who played and watched. In 1857 the club had a chance to rectify this position when the ground was put up for sale by its then proprietor J.H. Dark. It was an opportunity that the Marylebone CC failed to take and thus they further weakened their condition through continued negligence.

Only a few years after the legalisation of round-arm the battle-lines were redrawn for the debate over the introduction of over-arm bowling, the logical and natural development of round-arm. Over-arm bowling was finally legalised in 1864 and the pattern of its ratification ran along similar lines to the previous controversy. Once again the conservatives were intransigent to the last. Indeed, James Pycroft sincerely believed as late as 1865 that all forms of bowling other than underarm should be abolished.² By the early 1860s the Marylebone CC was under fire from all sides, including both the professionals and some of the newly formed counties. The dispute over bowling and growing calls for the reform of the LBW law became magnified into a challenge to the Marylebone CC's right to legislate for cricket. This was played out in the pages of *Bell's Life* and its newly established rival *Sporting Life*. The over-arm debate had reached crisis point with virtually everyone accepting the technique apart from the grandees at Lord's and their followers. By taking this stance the committee was on the threshold of abdicating any power they once had. The culmination occurred with a demand from *Sporting Life* that a cricket parliament be created to reform the laws and organise the game on a rational basis.³ And yet what was happening was not so much old cricketing bodies attempting to usurp the old authority, but a new movement thrusting its way onto the cricket scene, the movement to expand and organise county cricket as the basis of first-class competition.

1 Sissons, *The Players*, is the definitive history of professional cricketers and deals in great detail with the formation of the XIs and their influence on cricket, which was undoubtedly enormous. For further details on this aspect of cricket and its development see Sissons pp.3-69.

2 Pycroft, *Cricketana*. The bowling question is one of the major themes of the book.

3 *Sporting Life*, (1 April 1863), p.4. The paper specifically felt that the Marylebone CC was not equipped to cope with the massive expansion of cricket that had occurred and had shown this in its inability to reform the laws properly. It was therefore suggesting that the club be made an upper house, while delegates from the counties and the elevens should form a representative assembly. It concluded that 'cricket being now acknowledged as one of our national institutions, requires something more than a body of private gentlemen to administer its laws...'

This again had partially been a result of the initiative of *Sporting Life* which put its weight behind the new county movement,¹ and by this *action* against the professionals. Indeed, county cricket was a thoroughly innovative movement. Sussex and Surrey CCCs had been formed somewhat earlier,² but the bulk of the county organisations were the result of frenetic activity in the early 1860s. In 1860 Nottinghamshire was formed and then in 1863, when moves were first being made against the Marylebone CC, Middlesex, Yorkshire and Hampshire were founded. They were joined in 1864 by Lancashire and Worcestershire in 1865. It was only in the early 1870s that Derbyshire, Gloucestershire and Kent became established. In effect an entirely new form of cricket was being invented, based around counties, but really largely concentrated on the towns and cities.³ The attempt to form a cricket parliament was therefore an attempt to create an entirely new structure for cricket, which if it had succeeded might well have changed the way that the game subsequently developed.

This attempt to create a new form of cricket was a response to two different things. Firstly, it was an attempt to curb the importance of professional cricket, bringing the professional cricketers under the ambits of the dominant class. Secondly, it was part and parcel of the movement to re-organise sport along rational lines, a bourgeois attempt to reform the old 'traditional' sport into a new form.⁴ The fact that

1 *Sporting Life* was continually publishing details of the growing county movement as well as laying down the criteria which defined a county cricket club. See (24 Jan. 1864), p.4, on the foundation of a Hampshire CCC. It believed that county cricket had to be based around a shire and had to be instituted by the leading social lights of the district. Furthermore, it added on (30 Jan. 1864), p.4, that 'the indispensable qualifications to that honourable and exalted position are that the club must include the best amateur and professional talent of the district, must have the necessary funds and be able to assert its position in the cricket-field against other county elevens'.

2 Sussex was founded in 1839, while Surrey was founded in 1845.

3 For the formation of counties see individual county histories: C.Lee, *From the Sea End. The Official History of Sussex County Cricket Club*, (Partridge Press, London 1989); D.Lemmon, *The Official History of Surrey CCC*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989); D.Moore, *The History of Kent County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1988); A.Rippon, *The Story of Middlesex County Cricket Club*, (Moorland publishing, n.p. 1982); A.Woodhouse, *The History of Yorkshire County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989); P.Wynne-Thomas, *The History of Lancashire County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989). These are a cross-section of a variety of different books. One of the best examples of how a county club was formed is displayed in Moore's book on Kent, pp.15-17. Kent was an example of a club that was created from a merger of two clubs, one representing East Kent the other West. In 1870 the Beverley Cricket Club joined the Town Malling Cricket Club of Maidstone. This was the result of many years attempts at uniting the disparate interests of the bourgeoisie, the gentry and the aristocracy. For more general comments see Sissons, *The Players*, pp.72-6.

4 Consequently it is necessary to see this entire movement in similar terms to the foundation of the Football Association and other such ruling bodies, as well as the more general shift towards sports that were organised and humane. This was part and parcel of what has been seen as attempts at middle-class intervention in sport. See Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution*, pp.22 and 119 etc.; Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society*, ch.7, pp.118-56; Thompson, *The Rise of*

cricket already had rules, a quasi-governing body and was part and parcel of some of the country's cultures, is of lesser consequence. County cricket and the cricket parliament were to be efforts to organise cricket along national and competitive lines. The social background to this was rooted ideologically in rational recreation,¹ and structurally in urbanisation.² The actual process of forming these clubs involved an alliance between aristocracy and upper-middle class urban professionals, as was happening in the more general process of class formation. And yet despite this challenge, the Marylebone CC headed off the proposed parliament, survived, revived its fortunes and eventually placed itself firmly at the head of a cricketing administration.

The defeat of the move towards a cricket parliament was the result of the need of the Marylebone CC and the counties to co-exist. If the newly emergent counties had wished to flatten the Marylebone CC they could have done so. A cricket schism may have occurred, although it would have been of little importance because it would have resulted in the absolute obliteration of the Marylebone CC as a cricketing force. But it just so happened that there were two factors running in favour of the Marylebone CC. Firstly, it was at about this time that the Eton and Harrow match was becoming a popular Society event, ensuring the expansion of the membership of the club and guaranteeing, even underwriting, the social prestige of the institution. This social prestige in itself was an important asset for the club to possess, not least because it gave them claims of social precedence and leadership. Secondly, the professional teams were still very strong indeed, and although there had been schisms and disagreements over

Respectable Society, pp.271-2 (basically a re-iteration of the Malcolmson thesis). Note that there is divergence in interpretation between Cunningham and Malcolmson, particularly as Cunningham attacks the idea of the stable traditional society that is a crucial part of Malcolmson's thesis. Also see Vamplew, 'Sport and industrialization: an economic interpretation of the changes in popular sport in nineteenth century England', pp.7-17. Middle-class interventionism is also implicit in the work of social historians who use the social control model, see Donajrodzki (ed.), *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain*; E. and S. Yeo (eds.) *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914*.

1 For the linkages between rational recreation and the middle classes see Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*, esp. ch.6, pp.133-53.

2 Urbanisation when combined with industrialisation created the potential for a sports industry. Vamplew, 'Sport and Industrialisation', p.13, points out that between 1851 and 1901, the proportion of the population living in urban areas increased from 50.2% to 77.0%. Combined with an increase in real wages, leisure time and industry, this gave working people, as well as those higher in the social structure, the opportunity to spend more time and money on watching and, less importantly, playing sport. This enabled sport to become an industry in itself (p.17). The market for sport was therefore important to the counties, who were usually based in the largest urban areas of their district, because it gave an opportunity for increased finance through exploiting density of population. The links between the urban industrial complex and the growth of leisure was noted by G.Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75*, p.219-20; also, Best, p.229, notes that although cricket had a Victorian ancestry, 'it needed the diffusion of money and leisure and, above all, the railways'. The same trends are noted by Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*, pp.180-3.

the years, there was still a bull market for their cricket. Both Lord's and the Oval had had trouble with the professionals,¹ highlighting the need for unity, and despite the comments about the democratic Oval and the aristocratic Lord's, there was enough common ground in class terms between the administrators of the two organisations for there to be a degree of consensus based on common interest.² The fact was that the interests of the new counties and the Marylebone CC were almost identical, and this was underlined by the similarities in patronage at the highest levels. Indeed, even at this juncture, there was cross-membership between the administrations of the counties and Lord's. Frederick and Spencer Ponsonby were founder-members of Surrey,³ while the Walkers of Southgate were founders of Middlesex.⁴ The new movement was therefore not a conflict of class, but more a conflict of innovation. The real class conflict occurred between the counties and the Marylebone CC on the one side and the professionals on the other. The battle became more to establish county cricket as the legitimate form of the game and less over by whom or how the game should be controlled. Thus Pycroft, himself a member of the Marylebone CC, rabidly preached against the professional XIs and by doing so spoke for the entire county movement.

This is not to say that a championship was immediately established with the Marylebone at its head. Initial efforts to achieve this were far from successful. When

1 Surrey CCC was almost permanently in dispute with George Parr and other northern professionals during the 1860s. The disputes were based on a number of different factors. Firstly, it was the result of a no-balling incident at the Oval in 1862, when All-England bowler Edgar Willsher was no-balled for high bowling. The professionals suspected that the umpire, John Lillywhite, had been told to take this action by the Surrey Committee. Furthermore there was resentment over the first All-England tour to Australia. Parr believed that the Surrey secretary had schemed against him over the tour and had arranged that Surrey player H.H.Stephenson captain the side. This was partially the background for the split between the southern and northern professionals that occurred in 1864. See Sissons, *The Players*, pp.55-60.

2 See Charles Box, writing in 1877, quoted in Lemmon, *The Official History of Surrey CCC*, p.78. Also, Home Gordon commented that there was 'a good deal of underlying dislike between Lord's and the Oval, some of which may still linger among a few old members'. He went on to say that Lord Sefton had dubbed the two clubs 'The Lord's and the Commons', a remark of which Gordon thoroughly disapproved as a patrician sneer. 'Cricket Twenty Years Ago, and Now', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.14,(1902),pp.613-14. There was, certainly, tension between the clubs particularly around this time. However, there was also cross-membership at the highest levels, indicating that differences were ones of degree rather than absolute.

3 Lemmon, *The Official History of Surrey CCC*, p.16. They were both members of the first Surrey Committee.

4 Robert Grimston and the Hon. E.Chandos Leigh, Frederick and Spencer Ponsonby, William Nicholson, V.E. and R.D.Walker and R.A.Fitzgerald were all instrumental in the foundation of Middlesex showing the importance of the Marylebone CC to Middlesex. Indeed, it is worth noting that these close connections were forged a long time before it was even considered that Middlesex should play at Lord's. This also demonstrates that the Marylebone committee regarded the county movement as being important.

the Marylebone CC attempted to introduce such a competition in 1873 it was a failure of massive proportions. Instead, the competition evolved over the years, as did the control of the Marylebone CC. The championship was decided by the media not by a central arbitrating body. Nevertheless, over the years, the Marylebone CC established its informal network and when consulted acted as the great oracle of cricket. From about 1880 it started to exercise its will in a more pronounced way, backing up the counties when in conflict with their professionals, attempting to up-date the laws of the game through consultation with all major cricketing institutions and disciplining, or warning cricketers when it regarded such moves as necessary.

It is no co-incidence that the 1860s were the age when the mythology of the Marylebone CC first became established and the process of inventing tradition was put under-way. It was at this time that the club needed to draw upon a distinguished and heroic past to survive and flourish. At the same time it is hardly surprising that the myth of county cricket was developed in these times as well. It was necessary to fight the professionals on an ideological as well as concrete basis. By the 1870s much of the good that the professional XIs had done in promoting cricket was being derided, one commentator describing Clarke's formation of the All-England XI as being an 'evil hour for cricket'.¹ Thus county cricket, amateur led and amateur promoted, had become the true form of cricket, while the professionals were pushed to the margins, with the entrepreneurial teams surviving only as the outfits touring the colonies. The alliance between the counties and the Marylebone CC, at first a shot-gun marriage, was to blossom into a full partnership.

Amateur and professional: The Marylebone CC as a pillar of amateurism

The role that the Marylebone CC constructed for itself in organising county cricket was underpinned by their support for amateurism. It was the duty of the most gentlemanly club in Britain² to uphold the *status quo* over amateurism and professionalism. In other words the game had to be run by amateurs, for amateurs, with the professionals in a purely subordinate role. This the Marylebone CC was prepared to do from a very early date. As previously stated it was of the utmost importance for them to defeat the professionals and place them in a position within a

1 Anon., 'Cricket', Trollope (ed.), *British Sports and Pastimes*, p.308. The writer portrays the All-England Eleven as 'the monster nuisance of the day' (p.307) and then goes on to describe an invented view of what the professionals were like in the past, which included an idealised version of county cricket: 'in time past the mass of these men stuck to their counties, while a few of the best were hired by the great metropolitan clubs as bowlers, and released when claimed by their county. They were proud of being asked to play...They were civil and contented'.(p.308). This invented version of history was really a vision of what the writer and many others would have liked to see in the future.

2 Bar, of course, I Zingari, with whom the leading lights of the committee were connected.

hierarchy of cricket which was commensurate with their position in the social structure. The first instance of such action was in 1867, when the club established a fund for professionals. The fund was a direct intervention into the on-going dispute between the professionals of the North and South. Professionals would only receive help from the Marylebone Professional Cricketers' Fund if they had 'conducted themselves to the entire satisfaction of the committee'. The fund was supported by a small donation from the club's coffers, subscriptions and the proceeds of various fixtures played specifically for the fund. The implication of this device was that only cricketers who knew their place should apply and it was, therefore, a direct incentive to "good" behaviour.¹ Thus the committee commented that the purpose of the scheme was to 'ensure, if possible, for the future the good feeling which should exist between the professional players and their employers'.²

The next step that the Marylebone CC took against the professionals was made in conjunction with the counties. In 1873, they agreed a series of proposals which determined a player's right to represent a particular county. Effectively, this was an attempt to prevent professionals' mobility of labour. Amateurs on the other hand, coming from a class which was geographically more mobile, had more choice as to where they played. If a cricketer wished to change county he had to serve a two year residential qualification, thus restricting professionals' mobility by tying it to the suspension of earnings.³

The Marylebone CC was quite willing to do all within its power to support the counties themselves when challenged by fractious professionals, of which those from Nottinghamshire were generally the most militant.⁴ In 1881 there was a dispute between the Notts professionals and their committee. The dispute was effectively two-fold: whether the county committee or the players could arrange fixtures; and the players' desire for greater security. Shaw and Shrewsbury had accepted an invitation from Bradford to take a Notts side to play Yorkshire in that town. The committee resisted this and decided to make the issue one of who had the right to run county cricket and who should make the selection of teams. It was a deliberate attempt to undermine further the authority of professionals and to tie them firmly to the wheels of the county cricket movement. As the dispute developed, the Notts CCC decided to escalate the issue, by attempting to enforce certain contractual obligations upon the Nottinghamshire players, namely that they would play for the county rather than any

1 Sissons, *The Players*, p.60.

2 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 1 May 1867.

3 Sissons, *The Players*, pp.85-6.

4 Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, p.243. In 1880 the Notts professionals has asked for and obtained £20 a man to play the Australians. Those who had not signed the petition received £21.

other team when selected in the following season.¹ Thus players would be less free to choose who they played their cricket for and where they played it.

The dispute was a resounding victory for the Notts CCC and consequently for the county cricket movement. It was, however, partially orchestrated by the Marylebone CC, who backed the Notts committee to the hilt, although the professionals had asked the Marylebone committee to arbitrate. The committee 'expressed an opinion that all combinations among players to enforce their own terms to be improper'.² Furthermore, they censured the players involved. However, as several of the 'dissidents' were also employed on the ground-staff at Lord's, it was possible for the committee to go much further. They were threatened with immediate dismissal if they did not sign an undertaking to play for their county whenever asked, and after a while the committee decided to dismiss the 'ring-leader', the great Alfred Shaw, from their service. Despite receiving an apology from Shaw they refused to re-employ him, presumably 'pour encourager les autres'.³ The professionals lost this battle and with it they lost another piece of autonomy to the growing power of the counties, underwritten by the prestige and authority of the Marylebone CC.

This dispute was not the only intervention made by the committee against professionals. Although the Marylebone CC only had immediate control over its own playing staff, it was quite capable of bringing to bear considerable pressure on any player it chose, whether amateur, or more likely, professional. This was achieved by hauling the players up before the committee to explain any action that the Marylebone CC required to understand. On his first appearance at Lord's to answer a serious accusation or to explain a mis-demeanour the unfortunate was asked to appear before the committee. One can imagine the feeling of the accused as he was questioned and reprimanded by cricket's version of the Spanish Inquisition. The atmosphere in the committee room could have been made extremely sombre and intimidating if so required. The typical procedure can be seen in the case of Barnes, Flowers and Shrewsbury who in 1884 refused to play for England against Australia for £10. The matter was brought before the committee by V.E.Walker and then Barnes and Flowers were summoned before the committee to give their version of events. While we do not know what the defence of the players was, one can almost be certain that they stressed the fact that the Australians, who were designated as amateurs, were receiving more than five-times the amount that the English professionals had been offered. Thus the

1 Sissons, *The Players*, pp.174-7. Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, p.243, conversely says that the players had requested employment in every match and guaranteed benefits after 10 years' service, which does not square with the account of Sissons or the *Minutes of Marylebone CC*.

2 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 13 June 1881.

3 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, July-Sept. 1881.

matter was adjourned, it having been decided that the committee would not take the step of refusing to select them for the 'Gentlemen against Players' game. The final verdict was that the committee expressed 'their strong disapproval of their [the players] want of public spirit', and this resolution was given to the papers to publish. It was also decided to pay the players £10 for the game and no more.¹

This last incident leads one immediately into the area of the Marylebone CC's attitude towards amateurs, which is the direct product of the committee's views on class and society. As can be seen from the club's actions towards the schools and universities, to them the highest form of cricket was that played by the amateur. It was this above everything else that powered the movement for county cricket. The Marylebone CC itself was probably the primary supporter of amateur cricket. Yet, at the same time it owed a debt to amateurism which meant that it was quite prepared to turn a blind eye towards the blatant shamateurism that had developed in the 1870s. The best example of the paid amateur cricketer was, of course, W.G. Grace, who it is estimated, made over £120,000 from the game of cricket,² many times more than any professional of that time. It was Grace, as a cricketer, who helped turn around the fortunes of the club. Lewis has commented that this phenomenal cricketer transformed the fortunes of the Gentlemen and indeed the Marylebone CC, to which he was rapidly co-opted:

Cricket and W.G. [was] cemented as one, and grew into a solid pillar of all that was good. In addition W.G. was an amateur cricketer who loved the Marylebone connection. He supported the club's matches and showed off the colours: as his fame rose to a national level, so he revived the club's stock in the nation's eyes. So too the Marylebone club, hanging on to W.G.'s shirt-tails, found its authority seeping back: away from the professionals who had set up their itinerant teams, and back to amateurs.³

He was important enough to the club for them to pay his subscription, thus in May 1884 the minutes record that 'The question of the payment of W.G. Grace's subscription which had for fourteen years been paid by the club was mentioned and it was resolved not to interfere with the existing arrangement'.⁴ When W.G. spoke the club listened. In 1877 he threatened to retire and the committee expressed its concern

1 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 30 June; 7 July 1884.

2 For the life, significance and earnings of Grace see E. Midwinter, *W.G. Grace: His Life and Times*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1981); W.F. Mandle, 'W.G. Grace as a Victorian Hero', in *Historical Studies*, Vol. 19, no. 1, (1980). For further comments on Grace and shamateurism, see, Sissons, *The Players*, p. 155-7; Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, p. 201.

3 Lewis, *Double Century*, p. 117.

4 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 5 May 1884.

over this decision. The Duke of Beaufort, president of Marylebone CC, said that 'he would consult Mr. Grace as to his future plans'.¹ When W.G. declared that he intended following his profession, as well as playing cricket for his county and Marylebone CC, the committee decided to arrange a testimonial,² as mark of their gratitude and esteem for the man. In 1880 Grace intervened with the committee on behalf of the touring Australians, who had been snubbed by Lord's. He managed to persuade them to give over the ground for a match between an England Eleven and the tourists. This was agreed to, but was foiled due to the prior obligations of the touring team.³

Despite murmurings in the press, the club was prepared not to delve too deeply into the question of shamateurism, an issue that they conveniently side-stepped for the whole of this period. Thus in 1877 'it was decided to take no notice of certain anonymous letters which had appeared from time to time in *Bell's Life* regarding the "amateur question"'.⁴ This continued to be their attitude, despite their ruling that amateurs 'may take expenses' but if they made a profit by playing cricket, they would be debarred from playing in the Gentlemen against Players game at Lord's.⁵ This never occurred and the *status quo* continued with many of the top amateurs receiving over-generous expenses, or even salaries for non-existent jobs. Even when Lords Harris and Hawke, supposedly two of the fiercest upholders of the amateur ideal, reached positions of considerable influence within the club, there was no change in policy. The only explanation for this is that they realised that amateurism and professionalism had little to do with payments and all to do with class position. It was realised that the only way that amateurs and, indeed, the supposed amateur spirit would continue in first-class cricket was if a blind-eye was turned to shamateurism. This was because the status of professional cricketer was regarded as so low that few from the amateur class were prepared to join the professional ranks. So it was not just a question of nice customs curtsying to great kings, as *Wisden* described what it believed to be the anomalous case of Grace.⁶ Sissons reveals that among others W.W.Read, A.C.Maclaren and S.M.J.Woods, were disguised professionals.⁷ The list was probably longer and may have included figures like C.B.Fry who, even if he was not a professional, used his name as a cricketer and athlete to sell *Fry's Magazine*.

1 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 7 May 1877.

2 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 21 May 1877.

3 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 5 July 1880.

4 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 19 Feb. 1877.

5 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, n.d. 1878.

6 Sissons, *The Players*, p.155.

7 Sissons, *The Players*, p.155-71.

Bowing to the spirit and not the letter of amateurism occasionally led the Marylebone CC and the county organisations to be hoisted on their own petards.¹ It meant that they were unable to act against the Australians who toured as amateurs, made more money than professionals and in terms of class position were regarded by English commentators as being below the status of gentlemen.² For all the dislike expressed by Harris and Hawke towards this arrangement, there was little either of them could do to alter the situation. The price of not investigating shamateurism was allowing some latitude to the Australians. It was for them and the rest of the Marylebone CC, a small price to pay for continuing to discipline professionals and keeping the 'feudal dream' alive. Amateurs were regarded as essential to the running of county cricket clubs and more importantly to captaining the county sides. Undermine this and the unity of the cricketing dominant class would be shattered. One of the ideological pillars of the county circuit would have been destroyed. The Marylebone CC could not afford for this to happen, not least because some of those who stood accused were playing members of the club.³

From Autocracy to democracy? The Marylebone CC and the structural organisation of first-class cricket

School, university, amateurism and precedence were the pillars on which the power of the Marylebone CC was built. Combined with the creation of its informal network the Marylebone CC became the major organisation behind domestic cricket by the late 1880s, as well as consolidating its role as the legislature. However, when the laws were re-drafted in 1883 the committee decided to consult the counties:

The secretary was directed to send to county secretaries and others a copy of the draft amended laws of cricket with a circular letter explaining that the committee were prepared to entertain suggested

1 A factor partially recognised by N.L.Jackson, 'Professionalism and sport', *Fortnightly Review*, Vol.67, (1900), pp.160-1, who could not understand why the Marylebone CC tolerated the Australians 'those great offenders against the first principles of amateurism'. He believed that the club should not 'shirk the responsibilities of their position by any longer winking at the grave breaches of the *lex non scripta* of amateurism'. The club ignored his advice!

2 For example, commenting on the 1896 Australian team, *The Athletic News and Cyclist's Journal*, (27 Apr. 1896), p.5, said, 'As regards the class of the men socially, it is much the same as that of most of the previous Australian elevens - good, straightforward fellows of the rough and ready sort, but the majority of whom in this country would undoubtedly go into the players' room rather than the pavilion'.

3 Grace was, of course, the most famous of these, but included in the list would be Stoddart, Maclaren, and Woods. Also see *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 22 July 1907. The Marylebone CC had persuaded A.O.Jones to captain an MCC England XI to Australia by making him manager and paying him a 'fee' of £300 (the word salary was crossed out). Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, p.201, points out that the club's firm line on amateurism was a stumbling block to representative tour selection.

alterations before the laws as amended were submitted to a general meeting.¹

While this is certainly the language of autocracy (they might as well have inserted the word 'graciously' before 'prepared'), from this point onwards the club was at pains to consult all the necessary people over law changes and some of their other actions. This was also the key premise in the setting up of a structure to control the game of cricket.

It was not until 1887 that a body was formed which had the intention of meeting solely to discuss matters pertaining to first class cricket. In this year the Cricket Council was formed for this purpose, superseding the informal meeting of county secretaries. On initial examination this appears to be an attempt to establish a central organisation along the lines of the cricket parliament. As such it might be regarded as something of a challenge to the Marylebone CC. It consisted of representatives from all the first-class counties, but it was never really more than a talking shop. Equally, it was founded by Lord Harris himself, who asked the Marylebone CC to send a representative. The council never wielded any power and at most was never more than an advisory body. Thus, in 1889 a letter was read by the committee from the Hon.Ivo Bligh, himself well connected within the Marylebone club, suggesting a slight change in qualification rules for county cricketers. Somewhat dismissively 'the secretary was directed to acknowledge the receipt of this communication'.² Furthermore its meetings were held within the confines of Lord's, thus proving its closeness to the Marylebone CC.

The council broke up in 1890 and was followed by various other forums all of which were more or less under the wing of the Marylebone CC, including the regular meetings at Lord's of County Secretaries and later on of the county captains and first class umpires. All the time, the Marylebone CC committee, through its Cricket and Selection sub-committee, acted on advice and generated new proposals. Therefore in 1898:

It was resolved a letter be written to the cricketing counties to the effect that it had been represented to Marylebone CC that dissatisfaction exists with regard to the "Rules of County Cricket" and that if the majority of the counties are willing Marylebone CC are prepared to appoint a committee to draft another another code of Rules which on approval by Marylebone CC shall be substituted for the present code.³

The Marylebone CC continually consolidated its influence, to the extent that in the same year it agreed to constitute a Board of Control to regulate Test matches in Britain.

¹ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 11 June 1883.

² *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 11 Feb. 1889.

³ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 10 June 1898.

Previously, each match was independently run by the host county, who were automatically responsible for financing and selecting the team for that match. This could cause tensions. In 1896 for the Lord's test match, the Cricket and Selection sub-committee:

Asked the opinion of the general committee as to the advisability of including K.S.Ranjitsinjhi in the England side. The general committee decided through the persuasion of Lord Harris that the "Committee think it advisable to play in this match cricketers of purely British extraction only".¹

However, for the following test match at Manchester the ever-popular 'Ranji' was selected and performed with exceptional aplomb to the embarrassment of the authorities at Lord's. With the creation of the Board, consisting of the president of the Marylebone CC, five of its committee members, and one representative from 6 first-class counties selected by Marylebone CC, this malaise could no longer occur.

In 1904 relations between the Marylebone CC and the counties were further formalised by the creation of an Advisory Cricket Committee, composed of one representative from each of the first-class counties and the Marylebone CC.² Its remit was to consider all matters arising from county or other cricket. It was in all senses advisory, the Marylebone CC committee being able to accept or reject any of its suggestions. Generally, acceptance and revision was the order of the day. Therefore, by 1914, Marylebone CC had become, in a sense, more democratic. But it would be better appreciated as a combination of the 'Omphalos' and the 'Delos' of cricket,³ and an all-powerful, unelected government. Thus, in domestic cricket after 1904, the Marylebone CC gathered the rest of national cricket around itself at Lord's. Indeed, in the terms of the governance of British cricket, by this time it was, to use the euphemism, a 'one party democracy', with that party being the Marylebone CC.

That the club was governing cricket in an acceptable way is apparent from the lack of challenges or resistance to its authority in the latter part of the period. For sure, there were undoubtedly criticisms of the club over many different issues relating to the game

1 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 15 June 1896. There may have been elements of racism in this decision. Home Gordon was apparently threatened with expulsion from the Marylebone CC by a veteran member, who had played for the Gentlemen and had served on the committee, if he had 'the disgusting degeneracy to praise a dirty black'. B.Dobbs, *Edwardians at Play. Sport 1890-1914*, (Pelham Books, London 1973), pp. 140-1.

2 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 11 Jan 1904.

3 A.G.Steele and R.H.Lyttelton (eds.), *The Badminton Book of Cricket*, (Longmans, Green, London 1901), p.27.

of cricket, some of these emanating from within the club itself.¹ But there was never an attempt to establish another cricket parliament, or similar organisation, despite the fact that there were constant calls for law changes to curb the extremely high rate of drawn games.² A typical demand was for the reform of the LBW law. It was said that some batsmen, notably professionals, were using their pads defensively, blocking balls outside the stumps that might otherwise have hit the stumps. This, it was believed, had led to a decline in batting style and cricket that was inexcusably defensive and dull. The club eventually discussed this matter in 1901. It was debated by the usual members, Spencer Ponsonby-Fane, Alfred Lyttelton, A.G.Steel, W.E.Denison, J.Shuter, Plum Warner. The proposed reform was voted in favour of by a majority, but that majority did not surpass the two-thirds that was required to ratify the new law.³ Such demands for changes in the law were always addressed to the Marylebone CC. The club itself was traditionally slow to re-act, and was often accused of being too conservative. However, it was generally understood that because the club was legislating for the whole of cricket, not just the first-class game, changes might be impractical, even if it meant an improvement in the product of first-class cricket.⁴ Equally, when the club did attempt to innovate hastily the end result was often farcical, as was the case with the famous net experiment at Lord's in 1900, where a two-and-a-half foot net replaced the boundary and all hits had to be run except those that went over the net.⁵ Caution, to the extent of preserving the *status quo*, was normally the watch-

1 R.D.Walker, 'Lord's up to date' in *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.10, (1900), pp.322-5, criticises the club for being 'unbusinesslike' adding that 'one cannot help feeling that there has been for a long time something radically wrong in the constitution of the executive body' (p.324). Interestingly, he also accused them of plutocracy, saying that even the Marylebone had become infected with the 'gate-money' fever, 'even at the school match this year a leading member was heard lamenting the threatening rain, not because the play would be interfered with, but on account of the consequent loss of half-crowns'. (p.325). This was an accusation that was very rarely laid at the door of the Marylebone CC.

2 See Hon. Sir. A.Lyttelton, 'Cricket Reform', pp.230-5; this article illustrates what people regarded as the typical malaise, and adds that although asking for a change in the laws was a bit like 'a proposal to tamper with Magna Carta'; the situation was so grave as to possibly necessitate rule changes and changes in technology. Interestingly enough Lyttelton was an extremely influential member of the Marylebone CC, and he was not the only one to make calls for changes from within the club. Harris and Steel both made their feelings known in an article in *Wisden*, (1900), pp.lxxviii-lxxi.

3 B.Green,(ed.),*Wisden Anthology 1900-1940*, (Queen Anne Press, London 1980), pp.6-14; Warner, *Lord's.1787-1945*, pp.129-30.

4 Knight, *The Complete Cricketer*, pp.24-5. Knight described this as 'a wise conservatism'. Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, pp. 121 and 152.

5 Warner, *Lord's 1787-1945*, p.123. Initially the idea had been to award 3 runs if the ball was hit over the net and to add 2 runs to the number run by the batsmen if it went into the net. The experiment was an abject failure. Likewise, when the committee ratified a proposal for widening the wickets after a suggestion by the county captains, they came in for criticism of their hastiness, with Sydney Pardon, the editor of *Wisden*, commenting *Wisden*, (1904), p. cxviii, that he had 'the greatest respect for the committee of the M.C.C. - a body composed exclusively of first-rate experts' but he could not

word of the club. How was it that a private club could behave in such a way? The answer lies in the composition of the committee. While it was 'elected' solely by the club, it was held to be representative by the counties and other bodies. Thus it was able to exercise a hegemony over other cricketing authorities due to the informal network combined with a general acceptance of the ideology and traditions of the club. The network and the tradition had become mutually reinforcing to create a system of government that had at its centre a body that due to its social position was regarded as being a symbol of social cohesion within cricket.¹ This is the gist of the remarks made by Major Phillip Trevor on the Marylebone CC, which demonstrate why they were allowed to administer in this way:

For generations past the committee of the M.C.C. has been remarkable for including not only the best players of the day, but also men whose administrative success in a greater world than the cricket world has been a guarantee to their utility in less difficult undertakings. None of these men have been financial gainers, and few (if any) gainers in any material way by reason of their position on the committee of the club...That is a point to be noted in these days when even the county cricket committee is being exploited for private gain by the political adventurer, who by the way generally

comprehend why they wanted to bring in the new rule so quickly and without a trial: 'As a rule they are - quite properly - much less hasty in attempting to alter the laws of the game', he continued.

1 The conservatism of the Marylebone CC has led to criticism from historians for its failure to modify the game to the needs of the spectator. K.A.P. Sandiford, 'English cricket crowds during the Victorian age', *The Journal of Sport History*, Vol.9, no.3, (1982), pp.5-20, and 'Cricket and the Victorian Society', *Journal of Social History*, Vol.17, (1983), p.309, is unduly harsh in his criticisms. He points to a deliberate refusal of the administrators to modernize cricket and that the Marylebone CC only made minor repairs to the rules (p.15). It should be stressed that since few, if any, were asking for major reforms until the turn of the century (and even then the clamour was one of conservatism rather than radicalism), it can hardly be said to be a 'refusal' on the part of the administrators. The only example that they had to follow was that of the Lancashire leagues which was, of course, unacceptable to the dominant class ideology of those that controlled cricket and probably to many cricket spectators as well. It is almost as if Sandiford cannot forgive the Marylebone and others for not selling out to the workers. He seems to believe that cricket had a god-given right to modernize and thus, because it did not, he praises the 'refreshingly different tradition' of Soccer, as opposed to the 'stodgy atmosphere' of cricket (pp.19-20). Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, pp.115-24, and 177, has followed this line from an economic stand-point. He reiterates Sandiford's view, but as he correctly notes 'The M.C.C. was slow...to act in the matter of product improvement via a reduction in the number of drawn games' (p.119). However, he also notes, that there were specific reasons for this and the lack of economic rationalisation in first-class cricket, although he does make market signals sound a bit like innate sex drive: 'Yet really cricket was more than just a commodity in the market place. Many of the game's supporters were willing to subsidise it for reasons of civic pride, county allegiance, or even national jingoism. It had become so much an integral part of English mores and tradition that it was not viewed primarily as a business proposition, and these social values of the game clearly hindered the responses of those in charge to market signals'. (p.179).

serves his novitiate as a municipal legislator at the expense of the rates.¹

It is striking that the major changes in the organisation of cricket occurred in the 1890s, after Harris and Hawke had become influential figures at Lord's. While for much of this period those who were powerful on the committee had shown interest in county cricket, as well as the more traditional school and university matches, it was only when there had been a slight change in the composition of the clique that major steps forward were taken. Once again this demonstrates that it was not so much an assimilation of middle-class reformers, as change in policy from the top, influenced by a shift in the leadership. In part this was a direct result of recruitment onto the committee, with more and more committee members being connected with the county organisations. But it was also due to the enormous influence of Lord Harris, who himself had a great belief in the ideological benefits of the county game. By 1914, on the domestic front, there was a consensus that the influence of the club was beneficial to the game and this allowed it a free hand to legislate, organise and influence.

III

The Marylebone CC and the Empire of cricket

One of the areas of Marylebone policy that changed dramatically during this period was its concern with international and imperial cricket. Having established ties with the counties and helped develop rules and regulations for the running of county cricket, a direct result of the committees connections with wider bodies and the ideological beliefs of the committee, the committee eventually established control over international cricket played in England and English touring sides travelling abroad. This proved to be the ultimate fulfilment of the Marylebone myth.

The most important area of imperial cricket was believed, by both the British and the inhabitants of her cricketing Empire, to be the sending of touring teams abroad. It served the twin purpose of giving an opportunity for the hosts to re-affirm their faith in Britain and the Empire and also of stimulating the game in the colonies by setting an example and a standard to be followed. The private tours, which became another expanding and important part of cricket in the 1890s, were an important aspect of developing this bond, whether this was the intention of their organisers or not. Once the Marylebone CC started sending teams abroad this gave them more power than any edict promulgated in conclave at Lord's. Therefore it is not surprising that Lord Harris should draw our attention to some of these aspects in a piece written at the very end of this period:

¹ Trevor, *The Problems of Cricket*, p.3. He goes on to say that the Marylebone CC was always disinterested.

In these latter days a fresh and important responsibility has been undertaken by the Marylebone CC, not of its own seeking but in response to the solicitation of the cricket Associations of the great Dominions and other colonies. They have preferred that cricket elevens visiting their shores shall do so under the aegis of the Marylebone CC, and the club therefore has the anxious task of selecting teams in the case of Australia and South Africa, as nearly representative of the best of English cricket as is possible, and also of arranging the terms upon which the cost of these visits shall be defrayed. Teams of lighter calibre are also formed to visit other parts of the Empire... There has resulted a conference of great importance, from a cricket point of view, between the representatives of the club and of the great Dominions which have, perhaps strengthened the cricket associations of the latter, and have certainly served to introduce a spirit of harmony which cannot but be of advantage to the game.¹

The first English team to visit Australia went in 1862. 41 years later the Marylebone CC sent out a team under its own auspices. Conversely the Australian equivalent of the Marylebone CC, the Melbourne Cricket Club, had been sending teams to England since 1886 and had been acting as agents for English teams visiting Australia from an earlier date. This discrepancy was the cause of complaint from an indignant correspondent named 'Southern Cross' in *Cricket* magazine in 1882:

Now turn to our team. No such invitation has been extended to them... Now that the colonials have shown themselves worthy of the antagonists of the best English elevens... have given a very great impetus to the noble game throughout the length and breadth of England, why should not the Marylebone CC, the mother of cricket, invite a team of such antagonists over, as we have already done more than one English team?²

This idea was not acceded to until 1893 when the Marylebone CC gave a limited amount of patronage to the 8th Australian touring team when 'it was resolved that ... if the Australasian Cricket Council find it possible to send over a representative team, it will be welcomed by Marylebone CC'.³ Why did it take Marylebone CC until this date to welcome officially a representative team from Australia and, more importantly, until 1899 tentatively to take the first steps in organising an English team for Australia?⁴ Indeed, up to that point the Marylebone CC's interest in any part of the Empire had been expressed simply by entertaining touring teams to dinner and handing out temporary honorary membership to various Indian princes who happened to be visiting

1 Harris and Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*, p.209-11.

2 *Cricket*, Vol.1, (1882), p.142.

3 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 14 Nov 1892.

4 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 26 June 1899.

Britain. The crux of the matter was that no change in policy was more the result of the change in personnel in the clique that controlled the club. The advent of Harris and Hawke was to have crucial significance to the Marylebone's involvement in imperial cricket. It is therefore necessary to examine their views on cricket and the empire as a partial explanation of the club's conversion to the cause of social imperialism.

Harris and Hawke and the Empire

Lord Harris was one of the most important commentators on cricket and the Empire. This was undoubtedly a case of him combining his love for the game and its ethic and his belief in the social imperialism. It was this that led to the greatest change in Marylebone policy towards the empire after 1890. Harris had always been an upholder of the good that cricket could do for the empire. Thus he wrote in 1885:

Can the historian ignore what cricket has done towards bringing together the mother country and the Australian colonies? We think not, and therefore we think ourselves justified in calling it a remarkable game, perhaps the most remarkable the world has ever seen. This fact at least is worthy of note, that practical colonial statesmen have not ignored and do not ignore, that cricket can be a factor in creating amongst Englishmen an interest in those great offshoots from the mother country. We are inclined to question whether the excitement in Australia has been greater over the transmission of a body of colonial troops to assist the mother country in the Soudan than it was over the successes of the first Australian Eleven that visited these shores.¹

Lord Harris always believed in the unifying power of cricket in the empire and thus he was one of the most ardent upholders of the colonial ideology of cricket. However, he also subscribed to the view that cricket had a civilising mission outwith the white colonies and was thus a supporter of the imperial ideology. He saw it not only as a game which had the power to unite classes and colonies, but also as a means of uplifting the native races of India. Before he left for his appointment as Governor of Bombay, he attended a number of celebrations given in his honour. At all these he echoed the sentiments shown above. But he also embraced the ideal of the improving mission of Empire:

England in her supreme confidence in an admiration for her own free institutions, had undertaken to educate oriental people on western lines, to imbue them with western modes of thought, and to encourage them to admire and to strive at western systems of government.²

¹ Lord Harris, 'Cricket', in *Cricket*, (26 Nov. 1885), p.454.

² *Scores and Biographies*, Vol.14, (Marylebone CC, London 1908), p.lxxiii.

Undoubtedly part of Harris' 'systems of belief' was the inculcation of cricket and its ethic. At a dinner attended by many members of the Marylebone CC

[He] said that he had done his best to promote the interests of the noble game in this country, and he hoped not unsuccessfully, and that he intended to extend his patronage to the promotion of cricket in India so far as lay in his power.¹

In fact promotion of cricket was one of the few noteworthy things that Harris achieved in office, although it did nothing to aid his popularity which was particularly low with the nascent Congress party, who vilified him for spending his time playing cricket to the detriment of more important issues.² But despite this Harris continued to reiterate his belief in the power of cricket and its importance to the Empire throughout this period and beyond.

Hawke also shared Harris's belief in Empire, although his methods of taking cricket's message over-seas were somewhat less altruistic. Hawke was responsible for sending out touring teams across the Empire. He himself accompanied G.F.Vernon's teams to Australia (1887-88) and India and Ceylon (1888-89). This gave the noble lord a taste for travel, which he continued to indulge with the organisation of his own touring teams to India (1892-93), South Africa (1895-96 and 1899-1900), the West Indies (1896-97), Australia and New Zealand (1902-1903), and with the captaincy of an Marylebone CC team to Argentina (1912-1913). It is hard to judge the extent to which these tours were designed to encourage cricket in the Empire and how much they were for the benefit of a group of amateur gentlemen acting as intrepid adventurers abroad who had nothing else to do in the winter save play cricket. Hawke was in no doubt that the former was a powerful motive. On his trip to South Africa in 1896 he commented that his 'object was to develop and meet South African cricketers'³ and it cannot be denied that this may have been true. His tours certainly had a beneficial effect for the cricket of the countries he visited. However, Hawke's main testament of faith was his memoirs written in the early 1920s and it is possible that he was attributing too much to himself. Certainly a reading of this work does make one suspicious of Hawke because it is egotistical, to say the least. Nevertheless Hawke was a man of the British

1 *Scores and Biographies*, vol.14, p.lxxii.

2 R.Cashman, *Patrons, Players and the Crowd. The Phenomenon of Indian Cricket*, (Longman Orient, India 1980), pp.4-13.

3 Cashman, *Patrons, Players and the Crowd*, p.155. Likewise Hawke himself said in an article 'On captaincy', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 14, (1902), p.478, that the duty of a touring captain, was 'not only to say "thank you" from the bottom of his heart, but to do his share in promoting the unity of hands across the oceans, and he may often find opportunities to suggest how local cricket may be improved'.

Empire. Touring South Africa in 1896, he did his bit for the old country when he dutifully took the opportunity to visit Farrer, Rhodes, Fitzpatrick and Phillips in gaol after the disastrous Jameson Raid. He took great delight in dining with them and relieving them of large sums of money in a game of cards.¹ He also refused to visit President Kruger on principle, although two of his team members went and vainly tried to persuade him to come and see Hawke's team play.² Hawke was also quite capable of waxing lyrical about India, which obviously moved him in the same way it did other imperialists. He even published in his memoirs a quite dreadful poem, which one must suspect he wrote in one of his weaker moments. It drips sentiment:

A land that we've conquered and have to hold
Though it costs us millions of lives and gold,
Shall we call her the jewel of England's fame?
Or throw our curse at her vampire name?
But whether we bless her, or damn her, or deride her,
We are bound by our honour to stand fast beside her,
The Empire's India.³

Of all those who belonged to the circles of Harris and Hawke during this period, Warner was by far the most Imperially minded and he donned the mantle of Hawke by taking several teams abroad. In other ways he was the natural successor to Harris, as he too was born in the West Indies where his father was Attorney-General of Trinidad. He was also the first to captain an Marylebone CC side in Australia (1903-04) and followed this with trips for the club to South Africa (1905-06) and Australia again (1911-12). Warner was a travelling cricket diplomat and there is little doubt that he was genuinely inspired by the idea of cricket and Empire and he used his oratorical skills whenever he was required to make a speech on the significance of cricket in some far-flung outpost of Empire. On the 1905-06 Marylebone CC tour of South Africa he quoted himself, on his departure from that country, as saying :

The games which could produce such fine sporting spirit, and had done so much for British manhood should be encouraged. By encouraging the principle of fair play they would show to the loser as to the winner the same hearty good fellowship which has

1 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.151. 'I never partook of a merrier meal', said the noble Lord of his visit; high praise from one who was a member of the gluttonous and uproarious gentleman's dining club, the Beefsteak.

2 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.158.

3 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, pp.274-5. I suppose that it is remotely possible that this is an unpublished Austin, but the reason I believe that this was penned by Hawke was his introduction to the poem: 'Here is an unpublished poem which all these years has been in my scrapbook and is too beautiful not to see the light of print...' Any man who could mix a metaphor so effectively was capable of writing such a poem.

characterised the feeling which animated the great crowds at Newlands and Johannesburg.¹

His writing on this tour was dominated by the recent Boer war and throughout Warner is at pains to demonstrate that reconciliation could come through cricket, as this anecdote demonstrates:

We had the pleasure of meeting Mr.P.de Villiers, a Boer Commandant in the early battles on the Natal side... and a courteous gentleman with the wildest enthusiasm for cricket. De Villiers was taken prisoner. At the time he happened to be wearing an old cricket sweater and trousers. A Tommy shouted, "look here lads we've got a cricketer", to which de Villiers replied, "yes you have..." He made no secret of the fact that he liked Englishmen, and hinted that South Africa would settle down rapidly and that there would be no distinction between Briton and Boer, all would be South Africans - if only, he added, "the newspapers would stop talking".²

Warner wrote many books about his tours abroad and all of them have an underlying imperial purpose. In the preface to *Cricket In Many Climes*, Warner wrote that Cricket was

Extending its influence wherever the English Language is spoken, and it is even said by diplomats and politicians that its friendly intercourse does much to strengthen the amity of nations, and to make for international understanding...Cricket, indeed knits together many interests, and the crown of its influence is the good-fellowship which accompanies it.³

This is the feeling that he and many others brought to the cricket fields of the Empire and it was a feeling which would have been acknowledged by not a few of the inhabitants of the colonies and Dominions.

Warner was just one of the lieutenants of Harris and Hawke, the two men who dominated Marylebone CC after 1895 and it was a reflection of their views when Warner wrote:

Cricket has become more than a game. It is an institution, a passion, one might say a religion. It has got into the blood of the nation, and wherever British men and women are gathered together there will the stumps be pitched, North, South, East and West throughout the British Empire, from Lord's to Sydney, from Hong Kong to the Spanish Main, cricket flourishes. It is the policy of the Marylebone CC to encourage the love of cricket in every possible way...And in these days when cricket has become the interest of the whole

1 P.F.Warner, *The MCC in South Africa*, (Chapman and Hall, London, 1906), p.218.

2 Warner, *The MCC in South Africa*, pp.29-30.

3 P.F.Warner, *Cricket In Many Climes*, (Heinemann, London 1900), p.vii.

Empire, whither should the Empire turn for guidance but to the club which has grown up with the game, which has fostered it, and which has endeavoured to preserve its best traditions? And it is the wish of every true cricketer that the Marylebone CC should so continue to conduct its affairs that it may always remain not only the trustee but the mother of cricket.¹

Previously the Marylebone CC was not interested in the Empire and they did not feel that it was their duty to send teams abroad or to establish important contacts with the cricketing colonies. They preferred to leave that to private enterprise and to individuals with a sense of adventure. This reluctance to get officially involved in imperial cricket led Hawke to say in 1937 that 'it has been possible to set aside a sum of money for the financing of tours in different parts of the Empire for the control of which the Marylebone CC at first accepted responsibility with some reluctance'.² This unwillingness was also noticed by the editor of *Wisden* in the same volume, with the codicil that:

It was right that cricket teams leaving these shores should come under the aegis of the ruling authority of cricket, and the decision proved wise, for the exchange of visits has had a very real effect in strengthening the Empire sense.³

The reluctance and the sudden change of heart in the Marylebone CC's attitudes towards Empire was a direct result of a change in the composition of the committee after 1890. As demonstrated above, it was after this date that the new Conservatives gained the upper hand. Consequently, it was from 1895 onwards that the major developments in international cricket occurred, culminating in the Imperial Cricket Conference of 1909 and the triangular tournament between England, Australia and South Africa in 1912.

The Marylebone CC and social imperialism

In the minutes for January 8th 1894 there is found this entry:

Re. Astley Cooper's proposed pan-Brittanian festival. A letter was read from the Hon. Sec. to Australasian conference (B.J. Parkinson) asking whether the Marylebone CC committee had considered the scheme and generally what they proposed to do in the matter:

1 P.F. Warner, *England v. Australia*, (Mills and Boon, London 1912), pp.17-19.

2 *The Times* (ed.), *MCC. 1787-1937*, (The Times Publishing Co., London 1937), p.13.

3 *The Times* (ed.), *MCC. 1787-1937*, p.31.

resolved to reply that at present they had seen no scheme but would be prepared to consider the same when submitted.¹

It was the 1890s and the great age of social imperialism, the zenith of which was reached in the jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria in 1897. The Diamond Jubilee was a pageant of imperial splendour and power, the psychological high-watermark of Empire. Since the 1870s a belief in Britain's imperial purpose had been growing, for many people triggered by the enthroning of Victoria as Empress of India. The poetry, literature, art and popular culture of this period demonstrated the extent to which imperialism had fired and captured the imagination of the British people. The repercussions were felt in sport and even within the confines of Lord's.

In 1891, John Astley-Cooper proposed the establishment of a periodic festival demonstrating the industrial, cultural and athletic prowess of the British race, the purpose of which was to strengthen the bonds of Empire.² Very soon the athletic idea came to surpass the others. In the issue of *Greater Britain* dated 15 October 1892, there was a list of the great and the good of the land who were espousing the idea of an 'Anglo-Saxon Olympiad'.³ This refrain was repeated by a range of daily newspapers and magazines including *The Times* which commented:

The proposal for the periodic idea of holding a grand imperial festival may not be as ambitious as an all-embracing scheme of Imperial Federation. But it is superior in one respect, that instead of imposing irksome burdens and fetters, it would foster a taste which the Anglo-Saxon race in all corners of the world cultivates with enthusiasm.⁴

It has proved difficult to discover any direct involvement in the scheme by the Marylebone CC, but the quote from the Minutes suggests that leading lights of the committee were sceptical about committing themselves to any such grand imperial design. Certainly there is no mention again of Astley-Cooper's scheme in the minutes. This may be partially explicable by the absence of Harris in Bombay. Nevertheless, there were key members of the committee who served in the post-1890 period who approved of the scheme. Among these were Harris, Wenlock, and Lord Jersey,⁵ and it

1 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 8 Jan 1894. It is also interesting to note that it was the Australian end of the movement for the pan-Brittanian games that contacted the Marylebone CC on this, rather than any British organisation.

2 K.Moore, 'Sport, Politics, and Imperialism: The Evolution of the Concept of British Empire Games from 1891 to 1930', pp.47-9.

3 Mangan, *The Games Ethic.*, p.52.

4 Mangan, *The Games Ethic.*, p.54.

5 K.Moore, 'The Pan-Brittanian Festival: a tangible but forlorn expression of imperial unity' in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, p.152.

is possible that the approval of the Imperial Cricket Congress and the inauguration of a triangular contest in 1912 were legacies of the idea of a pan-Britannic games. However, the Marylebone CC's reactions in the early 1890s do not seem to have been specifically different to those of any other organisation. They probably wanted to wait and see what became of the plans before committing themselves to the proposed pan-Britannic gathering.

Astley-Cooper's plans only reached a limited fruition in 1930 with the establishment of the Empire Games, but the seed of an idea had been planted and germinated. The Marylebone CC itself was about to be dragged along by the overwhelming beliefs of the day and the time when it could ignore the importance of cricket to the Empire was diminishing rapidly. Elsewhere it was being recognised, not least due to the private touring teams of Hawke *et al.* Wherever these teams went in the Empire they met an Imperial reception. Thus in 1896, Priestley's team in the West Indies was bade farewell by this speech made by the Solicitor-General of Barbados:

Mr. Priestley has referred to the sympathy which the West Indian colonies have shown to them, but it is something more than sympathy that we feel. We feel we are more brothers than friends (Hear. Hear). This strong filial feeling is only the natural outcome of the relationship which exists between us and the Mother Country. We are sons of Old England.¹

These sentiments were re-iterated Empire-wide and soon the Marylebone CC would not be able to ignore them. Equally, stimulus was being given to the game across the Empire by the influx of administrators who had been educated in the public schools, institutions which placed an intensely strong emphasis on the Games Ethic. Some of these men were members of the Marylebone CC and were even past or present members of the committee. Harris has already been discussed, but to his name must be added those of: the 3rd Baron Wenlock, who as Governor was keen to promote cricket in Madras; Sir A.W.L.Hemming, Governor of Demerara (1896-1897) and of Jamaica (1898-1904); the Hon.J.S.Udal, Attorney-General of Fiji from 1889; and, the 7th Earl of Jersey, Marylebone CC president in 1894 and Governor-General of New South Wales between 1890 and 1893. All of these men encouraged Imperial links through cricket and some of them, like Jersey, were prepared to represent the cricketing interests of the colonies in which they had served at Lord's itself. All of them, bar Udal, were able to welcome touring teams from Britain during their terms of office.

Lord Harris returned from Bombay in 1895 and was immediately installed as president of Marylebone CC. From this time onwards Australia and South Africa are

¹ C.P.Bowen, *English Cricketers in the West Indies*, (Herald Office, Bridgetown, Barbados 1896), p.24.

referred to in the same manner as the counties whenever law changes were discussed. Similarly, when every first-class touring team from the Empire was welcomed to dinner at Lord's, as had long been the custom, special guests were invited, often the Colonial Secretary or someone with imperial interests. Thus the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain was asked to meet and dine with the Australians on 6th July 1899.¹ He was also invited to the celebration of the return of the triumphant 1904 Marylebone CC side from Australia, along with the Colonial Secretary of the day, G.Hillyard. It was therefore inevitable that Marylebone CC should become caught up in the imperial mood. Once they had concentrated all domestic power at Lord's they were set to become the most powerful body in world cricket. Under their auspices they were able to inaugurate the Imperial Cricket Conference in 1909, although, like so many things, the original conception had little to do with the Marylebone CC.

In late 1907 'a letter from Mr. Abe Bailey had been read in which he proposed a scheme for holding an Imperial cricket contest between England, Australia and South Africa, in 1909'.² This suggestion was referred to the Advisory County Cricket Committee which endorsed the idea. Abe Bailey was one of the staunchest supporters of Cricket and Empire and had welcomed and entertained the Marylebone CC team which went to South Africa in 1905-06. It was probably the success of this tour and the return visit of a South African eleven the following summer which led Bailey to make this suggestion, although it is also possible that he may have discussed his ideas with someone like Warner before writing to the Marylebone CC. However, the Australians were not overwhelmed by the proposal, perhaps because they jealously wanted to guard their position as the number one rivals of the Mother Country. Although the Marylebone CC believed the contest to be a good idea, they were not in a position to enforce the participation of the Australians. Finally, not wishing to lose a lucrative Australian tour, they realised that the only solution was to invite the Australians alone, an invitation which was accepted. But as a compromise the Conference was proposed 'to discuss arrangements under which matches between England, Australia and South Africa might be held'.³ This was duly organised and by holding it at Lord's the Marylebone CC put its own seal on international cricket. Inevitably Lord Harris was one of the representatives in a series of meetings dominated by the Marylebone CC; and with the secretary of the club, Lacey, also proving extremely important in an organisational capacity.

¹ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 15 May 1899.

² *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 16 Dec 1907.

³ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 29 July 1908.

The result of the first Imperial Conference was the arrangement of a triangular tournament for 1912 and the establishment of the rules under which test matches would be played in future by the three countries. When the tournament was held imperial cricket was established on a firm basis and the Marylebone CC, which had concentrated all power around the environs of St.John's Wood, now fulfilled the imperial function to which its prestige as the premier cricket club in the Empire would appear to entitle it. Since 1903, when they first sent a team abroad, their indulgence in these activities had snow-balled. Within the following years the Marylebone CC sent teams to South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, the West Indies and Argentina. They received requests and imprecations from other areas to do the same. Thus, Sir Ernest Birch vainly wondered 'if the Marylebone CC will some day send out a team of amateurs to play in Malaya'¹ and suggested that the Marylebone CC might consider, for its own good, conferring 'the privilege of wearing the red and yellow ribbon on those in all parts of the world who are aspiring to wear it...In British colonies the wearing of the red and yellow ribbon is, and always will be, a much coveted honour'.²

The Marylebone CC was at last fulfilling its claim to be the headquarters of cricket and acknowledging an obligation towards the empire. In the annual report of 1911 it was stated:

A Marylebone CC team under Mr.A.F.Somerset as captain, has recently visited the West Indies at the invitation of cricketers in those islands. Your Committee have reason to think that such visits do much to encourage cricket and establish good fellowship.³

The club had moved with the times after frequent goading from outwith. They had been unable to resist the imperial tide and now they were undoubtedly placed in the position of the ultimate cricketing authority in the Empire. Thus, during the Australian cricket disputes, the different parties involved sought the legitimization of the Marylebone CC to add weight to their case. This occurred in 1905 after an Australian Board of Control had been established without the consent or wishes of the Melbourne Cricket Club and the South Australian Cricket Association. The dissenters attempted to elicit the support of the Marylebone CC by asking them to send out a side to Australia under Marylebone auspices.⁴ If the club had concurred it would have been seen in Australia as definite support for the rebels, thus giving them the authority of what was now accepted as the Number One governing body in the Mother Country. However, Marylebone CC

¹ Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, p.389.

² Warner (ed.), *Imperial Cricket*, p.390.

³ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 3 May 1911.

⁴ *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 3 April 1905.

steadfastly refused to take sides and when the newly constituted Australian Board of Control invited an Marylebone CC team to tour in 1906-07, 'the secretary was instructed to say that the Marylebone CC could not negotiate with any body which was not fully representative of all cricket interests in Australia'.¹ This was the oblique British way of saying 'pull yourself together', much favoured by governors interested in seeing fair play done, 'strictly impartial, old chap'. They continued this stance until 1907 when it was finally proved that the Australian Board was fully representative.² In the Empire, the Marylebone CC had symbolical value and there must be some truth in Harris's assertion that it was 'perhaps the most venerated institution in the British Empire',³ and Hawke's trite observation that the Marylebone CC had 'become the Parliament House of cricket, not only of Great Britain but of overseas Dominions'.⁴

IV

Conclusion: a private club with a public function

While remaining a private club, the Marylebone CC, as an acknowledged institution, had to fulfil public functions. This role was accepted in the early 1890s when the committee for providing playing fields for London asked the club to provide a representative and it was decided that the secretary should fulfil this duty.⁵ By committing themselves to such a cause, they were demonstrating a certain degree of what would now be called corporate responsibility. The same attitude was displayed when in 1906 they responded positively to a request from the British Olympic Committee asking them to nominate a representative and to co-operate with that body, thus displaying their acknowledgement of responsibilities within the wider arena of other sports. And yet, while the Marylebone CC were governing the realm of cricket in an effective manner for the first time, complaints were still being made:

But as a governing body the Marylebone CC has one absolutely original fault. It governs too little. It is too content to be a court of appeal. As a leader it leads too seldom. It is unaware, it seems, of the strength of its own prestige. It is slow to wrath and slower still to punishment.⁶

This would certainly have been the case in 1860 and at least partially so in the early 1890s. But times had changed and so had the Marylebone CC. In Britain it controlled cricket by its committee acting through an advisory body, thus fulfilling the same role

1 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 5 June 1905.

2 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 4 March 1907.

3 Harris and Ashley-Cooper, *Lord's and the MCC*, p.209.

4 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.260.

5 *Minutes of Marylebone CC*, 10 Feb. 1890.

6 Trevor, *The Problems of Cricket*, p.250.

as the Jockey Club or the much younger Football Association, a role which it had previously neglected. In the Empire the Marylebone CC succumbed to the popular feelings and beliefs of the late Victorian era and, while it was not exactly dragged kicking and screaming into the age of imperialism, it nonetheless had to be shoved in the back by its younger committee members and by the suggestions of cricket administrators in the colonies.

Behind the development of the club into a public institution lay the class position of its committee and the invented tradition of the club. The ethic of the dominant class preached service for the public good and in the cricketing sphere this attitude was adopted by the committee. Consequently, after 1890, the committee became increasingly dominated by men who held beliefs that were heralds of the new social conservatism. They took a new interest in the cricket played in the Empire, seeing their role as the upholder of Britain's cricketing faith. All this added to the invented tradition of the club, making it an aristocratic symbol of English cricket. As the tradition became consolidated, the prestige of joining grew, inflating the club's social importance even further. Thus membership of this voluntary association could act as yet another demarcation of status within the dominant class. The Marylebone CC became locked into a cycle of producing and then reproducing dominant class social relations. The club thus became a mechanism of consolidation within the confines of English cricket. As will be seen, the lack of such a presence in Australian cricket resulted in clashes over who had the right to control the game converting the latter into a weapon of intra-class warfare.

Cricket, Class Formation and the Rise of the Bourgeoisie

Economic development in the nineteenth century was a process that began in the 1820s and possibly some years before. It was a process that was driven by the desire to improve the standard of living, the development of agriculture and industry, the growth of cities and towns through free enterprise and competition, the discovery and exploitation of large mineral deposits, and the development of a new social order. At the same time, in particular, the rise of the bourgeoisie as a dominant class split by different beliefs and interests, and a new religion. It was a process that was driven by the desire to improve the standard of living, the development of agriculture and industry, the growth of cities and towns through free enterprise and competition, the discovery and exploitation of large mineral deposits, and the development of a new social order.

PART 3

The Melbourne Cricket Club and the Struggle for the Control of Australian Cricket, 1860-1914

the exceptional case of Melbourne, the development of the bourgeoisie was a process that was driven by the desire to improve the standard of living, the development of agriculture and industry, the growth of cities and towns through free enterprise and competition, the discovery and exploitation of large mineral deposits, and the development of a new social order. At the same time, in particular, the rise of the bourgeoisie as a dominant class split by different beliefs and interests, and a new religion. It was a process that was driven by the desire to improve the standard of living, the development of agriculture and industry, the growth of cities and towns through free enterprise and competition, the discovery and exploitation of large mineral deposits, and the development of a new social order.

In relation to Victoria the origin and growth of the bourgeoisie has been examined from two very different viewpoints. P. de Serville, *From Port Phillip to Melbourne before the Gold Rush* (Oxford University Press, London 1982), examines the rise of 'good society' in other words the creation of an upper class that split into two different groups those who were 'gentlemen' and those who were 'respectable'. De Serville believes that the creation of this society was very important in the development of the colony, but he does not see its creation in the context of class evolution, for the bourgeoisie, even in its work, is a 'middle' working class. However, M. Sullivan, *Men and Women of Port Phillip: Past and Imagination* (Sydney 1987), looks at the creation of class from a very different perspective (the life of one 'good' man) and appears to be a description of the rise of the bourgeoisie. Sullivan not only examines the development of the class structure in the Melbourne area. He looks at the formation of classes, suggesting that a class society was in place before the gold rush occurred. Thus the class structure developed after the creation of a labour market and the emergence of a new class was transformed. Implicit in his work is an explanation for the origin of class structure in Victoria.

I

Cricket, Class Formation and Conflict in Australia

Economic development in the eastern colonies was swift and steady from at least the 1820s and possibly some years before. Inflows of capital and labour, both free and unfree, the development of pastoralism and agriculture, the creation and building of cities and towns through free enterprise and state provision, tempered by the discovery and exploitation of large mineral deposits,¹ led to the swift rise of a class structure in Australia and, in particular, the rapid emergence of a dominant/ruling class.² But it was a dominant class split by different beliefs about society, economics, politics and religion. It was united superficially under the banner of property/capital, but yet divided

1 The economic debate in Australian history is complex and controversial. N.G. Butlin, for example, in *Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1964), opened up the field with his theory that Australian growth was in part the result of the exceptional rate of urbanisation and the very early orientation of economic activity towards commercial-industrial specialisation and the tertiary services of urban society (p.6). Some have argued that this view was right to an extent, e.g. R.V. Jackson, *Australian Economic Development in the Nineteenth Century*, (Australian National University Press, Canberra 1977), while others have felt that his emphasis on urbanisation was misplaced. For example, W.A. Sinclair, *The Process of Economic Development*, (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1976), has emphasised the importance of staples, especially wool, rather than urbanisation, and another traditional explanation, gold. Butlin's revised GDP estimates, N.G. Butlin, 'Australian National Accounts, 1788-1983', *Source Papers in Economic History*, (No.6), (Australian National University, Canberra 1985), seems to back up a slightly modified version of his earlier claims, with both construction and pastoralism being important elements of GDP particularly after the 1860s when both industrial subdivisions rapidly overtook mining (as did manufacturing) as a percentage of GDP. As far as class formation in Victoria is concerned all that is needed to be known is the relation between those that owned property and those that did not. Undoubtedly class was mainly based upon ownership of property, although status distinctions were very important within the domain of the dominant class. Nevertheless, it is important to understand that it was, to a large extent, economic conditions that placed pastoralists, merchants and certain professions at the head of Melburnian society.

2 In relation to Victoria the origins and growth of the dominant class has been examined from two very different viewpoints. P. de Serville, *Port Phillip Gentlemen and Good Society in Melbourne before the Gold Rushes*, (Oxford University Press, London 1980), examines the rise of 'good' society, in other words the creation of an upper class that is split into two different groups: those who were 'gentlemen'; and those who were 'respectable'. De Serville believes that the creation of this society was very important to the future development of the colony, but he does not set its creation in the context of class evolution, for like Rubinstein, there is in his work a 'missing' working class. However, M. Sullivan, *Men and Women of Port Phillip*, (Hale and Iremonger, Sydney 1985), looks at the creation of class from a very different perspective (the title of the book itself appears to be a deliberate parody of de Serville). Sullivan set out to examine the development of the class structure in the Melbourne area. He looked at the formation of classes, suggesting that a class society was in place before the gold rushes occurred. Thus the class structure developed after the creation of a labour market and the structure of the state was formalised. Implicit in his work is an explanation for the origins of class conflict in Victoria.

into different interest groups, fighting for the control of the dominant class and by this particular ^{fact}, Australia. Was it to be the ideology of those involved in agriculture, trade or manufacturing? Who would be the dominant group: those who were born into the ruling class of Britain; or those who were, like their industrial entrepreneurial counterparts at 'Home', rising in society through the deployment of their wealth? By the 1890s, a more coherent ruling class had been created, but there was still a fundamental division in bourgeois ideology.¹ This was the battleground on which the dominant class of Australia fought a civil war for the control of cricket, a battle over which ideology would be dominant: either the quasi-aristocratic/elitist ideology, tempered in a fire of social conservatism and adopted by the Melbourne Cricket Club and some other clubs; or the ideology of the meritocrats, connected with radical liberals and some urban professionals.² Thus, cricket became a key social institution in the creation of community and class structure.³

But the battle was to go deeper than this. It was to be sustained by loyalties which in turn were reinforced by each man's personal position in the organisation of cricket

1 For a general history of class formation in Australia two works in particular are invaluable: R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, examines the rise of a class structure from a hegemonic/Gramscian point of view. Between 1840 and 1890 they see the Mercantile Bourgeoisie establishing a position of hegemony, although they are constantly challenged by the pastoral capitalists and the emergent working class. This view was not wholly accepted by K. Buckley and T. Wheelwright, *No Paradise for Workers*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1988), which adopts a more orthodox Marxist position, seeing elements of the class structure and capitalism being exported to Australia from Europe and then developing in a specific way. They see class power rising directly from the economic system, and repression being a function of both the economic system and the state that has evolved out of it. Connell and Irving are particularly sensitive to divisions within the dominant class, see pp.112-20. In itself the process of class formation was protracted as well as being a continuous and always on-going process. It is this that led to the existence of a dominant class that was fragmented. Concerning this, this thesis rejects the view of J. Rickard, *Class and Politics. New South Wales, Victoria and the Early Commonwealth, 1890-1910*, (Australian National University Press, Canberra 1976), who proposes that by the end of the nineteenth century the class structure of Australian society had solidified, and in the process consciousness of class had become a comfort rather than a scourge. If the evidence presented in this thesis is correct then it is impossible to say that there was a fully developed class consciousness even in the dominant class. Whether working-class consciousness at any level could be regarded as a comfort is highly debatable.

2 This battle of ideology was specifically different to the one described by Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.112. they see 'a struggle for control of the state' which 'on the political stage...was projected in terms of rival social orders: plantation capitalism versus *laissez-faire* capitalism'. The battle was therefore between two different ideologies. Nevertheless, as will be seen, the disputes in which the Melbourne CC were involved were partially between conservative ideologies, held by urban professionals and businessmen, and liberal ideologies, held by urban professionals and businessmen.

3 Proving Stoddart's point that sport strengthened its claims as a key social institution during the formation of the social structure and therefore became embedded in the class and status make-up of growing communities. B. Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, p.17.

and the class structure. Each individual had four levels of loyalty, which determined where they stood in the dog-fight over cricket. Firstly, there was the day-to-day loyalty to a specific cricket club. In Victoria, there were several premier cricket clubs, a group that included, the Melbourne, East Melbourne, South Melbourne, Carlton and Richmond CCs. Generally loyalty to one's club reflected the position of that person within society, or at least how that person thought of themselves. However, there were many who held dual membership, which tends to confuse the issue. For example, often a cricketer might belong to the East Melbourne and Melbourne Cricket Clubs. In these cases his individual loyalty can be gauged by his motivations for joining the Melbourne CC. If this was from a desire to secure seats in the Member's Enclosure for big cricket matches, then almost certainly they were, first and foremost, a supporter of the East Melbourne. Membership of the Melbourne CC was in these cases purely a social convenience, something that was almost expected of a cricket 'lover' of certain social standing.¹

The second level of loyalty was that of colonial or state. The differences between clubs were submerged when it came to supporting one's own colony in a game against a rival colony. Nevertheless, the submersion of these intra-colonial loyalties in the face of a game against an old neighbour and enemy was not a foregone conclusion. Factions frequently developed within the cricket Associations which were supposed to control the intercolonial matches for each colony. Thus a united front was often thwarted. For example, selection of players could be a thorny issue and caused disputes along club lines. Come the day of the match itself, it was possible for these disputes to be buried beneath a sea of rhetoric which encompassed the usual themes of 'fair play', conciliation through cricket and the demonstration of the 'manly' characteristics that were supposed to be the national embodiment of Victoria/Tasmania/New South Wales/or South Australia.² Invariably, this was underpinned by a sporting comment on the worthiness of the opponents, but this was no more than the sporting formalities of the game and often the implication was that one's own colony was better than the rival,

1 The situation was certainly not the same in Sydney, except when the Albert Cricket Club was in existence in the 1860s. A similar clash did exist later on, after the formation of the Association Ground, where the trustees formed a club specifically for watching cricket, i.e., its main function was to provide members with seats etc. From the late 1880s the Trust was in conflict with the Association and the battle that ensued bore remarkable similarities to the one in Melbourne. It is certain that loyalties and rivalries between clubs and districts was equally as fierce, although these loyalties may have developed more through territorial than the social clashes that occurred in Melbourne. For example, loyalties to Randwick or Paddington in Sydney were probably determined by attachment to those districts, whereas loyalty to the Melbourne or E.Melbourne CCs was often not related to such attachments.

2 All colonies in fact. Queensland and Western Australia have been left off the list because they were the latest arrivals in the arena of intercolonial cricket.

if not in cricket, then in other matters. Consequently, these feelings frequently led to an over-spill of emotion on the part of crowds and players, and disputes resulted. The most memorable occasion of this particular occurrence was the fracas produced by George Marshall's gamesmanship for Victoria against New South Wales in 1862. This nearly led to the abandonment of the match and caused the suspension of the series between the two arch-rivals for a short while.¹ At other times relations between the Associations was so poor that the Melbourne CC imperiously stepped in to run the fixture (1889), while if one colony fared better than the others against touring English teams, great delight would be taken in its superiority over the other. Colonial rivalry even resulted in an occasion when two separate English sides were invited to tour in the same season. The result was financial woe all round and not a few recriminations (1887). After Federation, things got no better, state rivalry merely replaced colonial rivalry.

The third level of loyalty was to Australia, as a unified concept, or continent. It was a form of Australian nationalism that has been examined in some detail by Mandle and in passing exposition by McLachlan.² This loyalty was chiefly expressed during clashes with England for the semi-mythical, wholly metaphorical, 'ashes'. Mandle's examination of this aspect is more or less adequate, as it does, to an extent, express the ups-and-downs of loyalty to Australia, as well as demonstrating the motivations for expressing differing types of nationalism - whether it was using cricket as a demonstration of the development of an Australian race or 'type', or cricket as a symbol of a composite Australian pride. This can be modified by the use of the theories of Douglas Cole and Richard White. It is necessary to show that Australian loyalties were subject to several variables that were products of class and ideology. There were two main sources of pressure on Australian National loyalty. The first was the aforementioned intercolonial/inter-state rivalries, which were the cricketing equivalent of the battles over the Riverina areas, while the second was the last layer of loyalty and manifested itself in a general belief in the imperial standard.³

1 For a full description of this dispute, see Cashman, *'Ave a Go!*, p.27.

2 W.F.Mandle, 'Cricket And Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', pp.225-46; K.S.Inglis, 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1877-1900', In Cashman and McKernan (eds.), *The Making of Sporting History*, (1979); N.McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution*, pp. 155-6; W.Frost, *The 1861/2 All-England Cricket Eleven Visit to Melbourne and its Effect on the Links between Victoria and England*, (B.A Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1986); and S.Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, pp.16-17. While it is agreed that Mandle's work is extremely important, it is necessary to modify his arguments to include the possibility that Australians had other loyalties as well as the national one.

3 D.Cole, 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship. Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914'; R.White, *Inventing Australia*. Cole examines three different ethnocentric ideologies that co-existed with each other in Australia. He equates Australian Nationalism with Australian ethnocentrism, which he believed could

This belief might be better expressed as what Cole calls Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity. In many ways, this was the weakest of all the loyalties, not least because there were distinct elements of Anglo-Saxon ethnocentricity in Australian Nationalism. Nevertheless it was an ideology that was frequently expressed at times of great international tension and warfare. Thus, the best expression of this in non-cricketing terms was a result of the Sudan crisis and also the outbreak of the Boer war. It was basically an expression of solidarity with Britain, based upon the belief of a common racial heritage. Part of that heritage was perceived to be cricket. Australians never denied the Englishness of Cricket, instead they reacted in the same way as Scotland did with Soccer.¹ They developed it to their own ends, so people came to believe that there was a distinctive Australian style of cricket. At the same time meetings between 'mother' and 'daughter' provided ample opportunity for politicians, newspaper editors and cricketers to express a joy in this common heritage and a love of that mythical place, 'Home'. This particular bond had the potential to subdue the nationalist instinct, but also had the potential to strengthen it. As Cole demonstrates, the relationship between the racial loyalties of Anglo-Saxonism and the political loyalties within Australia were very fine indeed. The boundary between the two was frequently crossed and the distinctions between the two could become blurred within an even more general racial ethnocentricity, which allied itself with the Caucasian against 'inferior' races. Cole explicitly states that, 'when pride of race became more useful, it was stressed. Indigenous [Australian] ethnocentrism was not dropped though it did become less conspicuous. The process required no tortuous revision of assumptions'.² Cole does not use the metaphor of a see-saw to describe the neat and precise way in which his theory works, although he might have done. Reality was not so functionally simple, as awkward concepts like class could impinge on such a rounded picture. However, his

exist comfortably besides a more general imperial loyalty and love of the mother country as expressed through Anglo-Saxon racial ethnocentricity, and racist ideology which was an out-pouring of an even more general ideology connected with the belief of the paramountcy of the Caucasian race. White, on the other hand, examines Australian nationalism in the terms of an 'invention of tradition', although his work pre-dated that of Hobsbawm and Ranger. In effect, he deconstructed the idea of nationalism, seeing it as a creation of the dominant class, as well as drawing off ideas about race and racial developments (he examines cricket from this particular angle, pp.72-3). Both of these works easily co-exist with Mandle, but they develop the theme in a more complex manner and therefore have greater relevance for this thesis. Also see for a general examination of Australian loyalties, J.Rickard, *Australia: A Cultural History*, pp.113-42.

1 For this particular issue, see R.Holt, *Sport and the British*, ch.4, pp.223-36 for the Dominions, pp.253-62 for Scotland and Football. Also see, H.F.Moorhouse, 'Scotland against England: Football and Popular Culture', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.2 (1987), pp.189-202.

2 D.Cole, 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship. Ethnic Ideas in Australia', p.522.

model adequately demonstrates the basic inter-relationship between concepts of nationalism and imperial loyalty.

These four inter-locking types of loyalty shared a large over-lap, but were often effected by class-based beliefs. For example, in the case of club loyalty, a person from the working class was more likely to be loyal to a club which could be associated with his and, less frequently, her area. Thus, they were more likely to be supporters of Richmond, Collingwood, or Fitzroy in Melbourne. These areas were all ostensibly working class, with the local economies based in manufacturing. They were less likely to support clubs like Melbourne and East Melbourne, which were ostensibly social clubs.¹ As far as playing was concerned, it was more likely that a member of the working class would play for a local team than one of the central 'social' clubs. The only working-class people who played for the Melbourne CC were professional cricketers. But, even within the socially prestigious clubs there was a hierarchy whereby the most socially prestigious members would control the organisation of the club. However, none of these factors prevented the inter-club rivalries and quite frequently differing class backgrounds would produce 'class struggle' on the cricket pitch.² Equally, some of the fiercest rivalries were manifested in matches between Melbourne and East Melbourne CCs, motivated by inter-bourgeois squabbling and a peculiar mixture of superiority and inferiority complexes.

Often, expressions of Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism were a product of class. Indeed, it would be possible to assert that those who organised cricket, because of their bourgeois background, were more likely to express devotions towards England. The history of this class's cultural cringe is long and well documented. At the same time, it has been noted that working-class support in international matches tended to be more vociferously pro-Australian and anti-English. However, one must be extremely careful when making such sweeping assumptions, as it denies the possibility of any development of a popular culture based upon the superiority of the British Empire. One must not forget either, that a lot of nationalist constructions were the product of bourgeois intellectuals themselves, particularly in the cultural sphere. The history of *The Bulletin* goes some way to demonstrating these particular conflicts, as it itself could be erratic in its loyalties, generally saying what it felt at any given moment in time (which was often completely at odds with statements that it had made before!). Certainly

1 E.Melbourne CC was originally founded in Abbotsford, an area of Collingwood. However, it soon moved to land in Jolimont given it by the government, not far from the Melbourne Cricket Ground.

2 Today Football matches between Collingwood and Carlton are a demonstration of this. In the late nineteenth century cricket and football matches between the Melbourne CC and the North Melbourne CC contained rivalries whose intensity is most plausibly explained by the difference in social backgrounds (North Melbourne was a predominantly working-class area).

The Bulletin could express rabid nationalism and anti-British imperialism, while doggedly expressing a fundamental belief in racial unity and the glories of the Anglo-Saxon race.¹ How far people agreed with *The Bulletin* is another matter entirely. Other sections of the Bourgeoisie might tend to be less vociferous in their expression of Australian nationalism, while cricket clubs like the Melbourne, seemed to be absolutely Anglophile in their devotions. At the same time this might not prevent them from wanting an Australian side to beat the hell out of the English.

All these loyalties created tensions that were potentially disruptive to Australian cricket and they directly effected the problem of cricket organisation and control. As will be seen these tensions could be ignited into a blazing inferno by small pieces of tinder, which might be a matter of representation on a cricket Association, or the problem over defining 'amateur' or 'professional' cricketers. The rest of this section of the thesis will examine these conflicts and tensions as seen through the eyes of the Melbourne CC, undoubtedly Australia's oldest surviving cricketing institution and one that happened to be not only influential, but also right at the heart of most of the serious disputes that occurred in Australian cricket between 1860 and 1914. It will also be an analysis of an élite institution and the effects that its attitudes to cricket, class and colonialism had on the rest of Australia. Therefore, it will be necessary to examine the social background of the Melbourne CC in order to locate the position of its committee members in the class structure of Australian society, as well as examining the effects of this background upon the organisation of Australian cricket. Thus the Melbourne CC will act as a focus to build a picture of Australian cricket. At the same time, the chapter will examine the role that this élite institution played within the wider sphere of colonial class development.

II

The Melbourne CC: an introduction

The Melbourne CC has been a significant part of the Melbourne dominant class establishment since its formation in 1838 and has always had an important voice in Victorian cricket. This is not least because they built, developed and controlled the premier cricket ground in the colony - a factor that gave the cricket club more power than many have previously imagined.² Throughout its history, until the first decade of

1 S.Lawson's biography of *Bulletin* editor J.F.Archibald, *The Archibald Paradox*, (Penguin, Ringwood Vic. 1987) demonstrates the volatility and inconsistency of *The Bulletin*.

2 The club was nominally founded in 1838 by a group of Port Phillip Gentlemen. It appears that during the early 1840s the club ceased to function for a while, probably the result of the depression that hit the district after its first early boom. The club was reconstituted in 1846 and it is from this point that it really took off. It was in 1856 that the club was granted its ground on the Richmond Paddock, where it has remained to this day.

the twentieth century, it attempted to impose its will on the rest of Victorian, and sometimes Australian, cricket. It was influential in organising the first Victorian intercolonial sides in the 1850s. It arranged fixtures in the up-country districts to promote cricket. It gave cricketing scholarships, consisting of two year membership for outstanding young cricketers from Melbourne's élite private schools. In the late 1860s and early 1870s, it took over the functions of the VCA when the latter could not raise enough money to fulfil its remit of organising intercolonial matches. It even usurped the role of the VCA on occasions, especially in 1889, when rivalries between the VCA and the NSWCA became so intense that it looked as if the annual fixture would not be carried out, and to prevent this from happening the Melbourne CC entered into negotiations with the NSWCA: furthermore, in 1901, the VCA actually approached the Melbourne CC with a view to the club ^{over} taking the functions of the Association. In the international sphere the Melbourne CC was equally influential. In 1873 it negotiated the bringing over to Australia of an English team captained by W.G. Grace, with the aid of the South and East Melbourne CCs. In 1879, it was responsible for bringing out Lord Harris's predominantly amateur team. In 1886, it organised, managed and sent an Australian XI to England, thus becoming the first club to carry out such an engagement. In 1887, it arranged, once again, for the visit of yet another English amateur team. English tours to Australia were dominated in the 1890s by a partnership between the Melbourne CC and the Sydney Cricket Ground (SCG) Trustees, and when the Australian XI went 'Home' in 1899, they were advanced money by none other than the club.

The importance of the Cricket Club was recognised by the Marylebone CC, which always consulted them on possible rule changes, although often in conjunction with other Australian bodies. This suggests that Melbourne CC was seen as an important cricket institution. Given these facts, it seems peculiar that, like the case of Marylebone, no-one has undertaken a scholastic study of the Melbourne CC. Dunstan's book, *The Paddock that Grew*,¹ is a good solid survey of aspects of the club, in that it demonstrates the importance it had in bringing in and ^{developing} a variety of different sports, ranging from pedestrianism and tennis, to shooting, baseball, and lacrosse. But Dunstan never explores the social structure of the club and he is never able to get to grips with the role that the club played in the disputes that were endemic to Victorian and Australian cricket. For example, he states that until 1912 the club was the most powerful force in Australian cricket,² with no equivalent in any of the other states. This

1 K. Dunstan, *The Paddock that Grew. The Story of the Melbourne Cricket Club*, (Cassell, London 1962).

2 Dunstan, *The Paddock that Grew*, p.101. He says: 'Before 1912, the Melbourne Cricket Club dominated cricket in Australia'.

is a case of overstatement: the club was an important and powerful force in Australian cricket, but it had never exactly 'dominated' it and by 1906, this power had been emphatically broken as a result of the first major cricket dispute.

The role of the Melbourne CC has been examined, to an extent, by a few sport historians. When this has happened, it has invariably been described as an élite club at the pinnacle of Victorian colonial society. David Montefiore, in his thesis on the 1880s cricket crisis, examined the club in more detail than others. He believes that links were built between the organisation of sport and men of 'wealth, status, power and political will'. In the instance of cricket he felt that these men stamped the game with their ideological beliefs, the Melbourne CC being the ultimate example of this in nineteenth century Australia. Commenting on the club, he maintained that membership was exclusive and highly prized. It was also an institution steeped in a 'Tory-Anglican' ideology and was essentially anglocentric. He states, that there was no other equivalent of the club in Eastern Australia, possessing both an organisational and symbolic function, and that these features were consolidated during the 1880s under the leadership of men like the ultra-wealthy philanthropist Sir W.J. Clarke.¹

This is an important contribution to the historical debate on Australian cricket because Montefiore is the first scholar to recognise the large importance of the Melbourne CC. Indeed, as he says, it appears that the 'authoritative' initials M.C.C. were no coincidence.² However, Montefiore's description remains superficial. This section aims to fill the gap in knowledge which surrounds the role of the Melbourne CC in the organisation of Victorian and Australian cricket. Thus, as with the previous section devoted to Marylebone, it will examine the invention of a particular sporting tradition through an examination of the social background of the committee. It will seek to explain how the 'generative' role of a sport created the tensions that nearly destroyed the fragile structure of Australian cricket. It will demonstrate how loyalty to club, colony and country dominated the choices made by individuals and institutions within the Australian cricketing world.³

1 D.Montefiore, "*Cricket in the Doldrums*". *The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s*, [B.A.(Hons.) Thesis (unpub.), School of History, University of New South Wales 1989], p.19. Furthermore, he defines the Melbourne CC as a social institution, rather than a community based club, with whom they were often in conflict. See pp.20-1.

2 D.Montefiore, "*Cricket in the Doldrums*", pp.20-1.

3 Stoddart, *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, p.34, states that from the onset sport in Australia was dominated by issues of wealth and status/station. Elsewhere he has examined the Western Australian Cricket Association (WACA) in the late nineteenth century and has concluded that cricket organisation 'was important in the consolidation of the dominant group's cultural values, particularly in socializing people who aspired rather than belonged to the original colonial gentry'. Thus, the established and aspirant gentry mixed socially to fortify the prevailing cultural values and WACA became a forum for social promotion and consolidation, Stoddart, 'Sport and Society 1890-1940. A Foray', p.653. This

III

Invention of Tradition: The Melbourne CC and the acclimatization of Victorian cricket

Cricket in Victoria was played at a very early date in the history of the colony.¹ It was to become one of the most important social institutions, with its traditions reproduced from Britain and then recreated to form something specifically Victorian. This process can be seen as part of a wider invention of traditions, serving the interests of a class as a focus for both social cohesion and social promotion. Thus cricket and its organisation became a feature of class formation in Victoria. This process became pronounced after the gold rushes utterly transformed society in the Melbourne region. One of the more striking results of this transformation was the attempt made to transplant the fabric of British society, customs and even plants and animals, into the strange environment of Victoria in an attempt to anglicise the colony.² Perhaps this was encouraged by the existence of a dominant class already in place before the supposed upheaval of gold who were prepared to continue attempts to reproduce the class structure of Britain. Like other aspects of Victorian society, sport was transformed by this boom period and because so many of the emigrants were from Britain, this transformation was, in affect, an attempted transplantation of institutions and customs that existed in Britain at that time. Nowhere is this better seen than in

section of the thesis uses similar methodology and theories. Also see J.A.Daly, 'A New Britannia in the Antipodes: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, pp.165-74, where he examines the uses that the Adelaide 'Gentry' made of sport as an integral part of class formation, with it, especially cricket, becoming part of a general pattern of conspicuous time-consuming consumption, while football was rejected because it became popularized (this is actually very contentious, but outwith the remit of this thesis).

1 The first cricket match was played in November 1838 and involved many of the founders of the Melbourne CC. J.Grant, G.Serle, *The Melbourne Scene, 1803-1956*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1957), pp.31-2 gives a contemporaneous account of the game.

2 Kingston, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.3, pp.177-8, 190; G.Serle, *The Golden Age, A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851-61*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1963), p.366; Rickard, *Australia*, p.83. Acclimatization societies attempted to introduce many different species of plants, trees and wildlife. In Victoria, in particular, Australian 'game', like Kangaroos, was thought to be dull and so foxes were introduced. Some societies aimed at stocking the Bush with livelier game and more tuneful birds, while those interested in the zoological side brought from England trees like Oaks and Beech. More importantly, Rickard notes that one Victorian advocate of acclimatization enthused over the combination of 'a virgin country, an Italian climate, and British institutions to lend force and intelligence' (*Australia*, p.63). Relevant to this thesis, Rickard also says that during the first century of white occupation of Australia there was a continuing process of cultural transplantation. Thus 'Institutions and ideologies were imported from the metropolitan society and planted in the colonial environment. Some took root better than others; some grew into unexpected hybrids. The shape they took determined the social landscape of the Australian colonies' (*Australia*, p.83). From this point of view cricket can be seen as one of the institutions and ideologies that took root and flourished and became one of the many shaping factors of class, culture and community.

cricket where the values of the game, with their emphasis on Muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism, were introduced and then reproduced. Thus, the Melbourne CC set itself up as a quasi-Marylebone and a newspaper called *Bell's Life in Victoria*, a direct copy of a British example, wrote about cricket and sport in the classically studded language of the English ruling class. Further, attempts were made to recreate the amateur/professional dichotomy of British cricket complete with many of its original features, including a Professional Cricketers Association. And finally, where a United Victorian XI was established in 1859, as a direct imitation of the peripatetic XIs that were still immensely popular in Britain at this time.¹

The same code of honour was upheld in Victoria as in the old country and was expressed *ad infinitum* in the editorials of *Bell's Life in Victoria and Sporting Chronicle*, which was established in 1857. It was a bourgeois journal, liberal in politics and anti-the power of the squattocracy and, yet, it was the mouth-piece of privately-educated correspondents who expressed the hopes and fears of the Victorian community through the bourgeois dialect of sport.² The early years of *Bell's Life in Victoria* chronicles the disputes and outlook of the bourgeois sporting community in Melbourne and consequently is a valuable document of class and society in the gold-rush period. *Bell's Life* was established at a time when the doctrines of Muscular Christianity and Social Darwinism became fundamental cornerstones of dominant class ideology. Thus, on the one hand the journal expressed the manner in which cricket would prove that there was no racial deterioration in the antipodes:

1 During the gold rushes, a number of professional cricketers emigrated to Victoria, among them George Marshall and Gideon Elliot. They attempted to reproduce cricketing institutions from Britain, most specifically a touring Eleven, which consisted of the best cricketer's in the colony, many of whom were professionals. The team lasted for a few years but then disappeared. Likewise, the Professional Cricketers Association was very similar in both form and intention to the British Cricketers Fund Friendly Society (CFFS) founded in 1857. It was to operate as a friendly society, helping professional cricketers who had fallen on hard times. Like the CFFS, it had as its patrons some of the leading members of the cricket establishment, all of whom were members of the Melbourne CC. Unfortunately the activity of these professionals is outside of the scope of this work, except when they played for the Melbourne CC, which also attempted to uphold the customs of amateur and professional from 'home'. See below chapter 6.

2 This included rampant classical allusion in the most pompous of styles, exactly replicating *Bell's Life in London*. For example, an article on the benefits of sport for training men to fight in war, *B.L.V.*, (9 Jan. 1858) (note, this journal does not have any page numbers), includes words like 'Rhodomantadising'. *B.L.V.*, (13 April 1861), in an article on the possible visit of the All-England XI, the following comment is found: 'What was the fruit of the labours of the committee? Parturient montes, nascetur'. 'Stumps' letter of (6 July 1861) contains such classic staples as: 'Forti et fideli nil difficile...audentes fortuna juvat...iox et praetera nihil'. It is notable, that *Bell's Life in Sydney*, maintained the same high standard of classical allusion.

To thoughtful and physiological minds a theme is presented worthy of serious contemplation; and that theme is a comparison of their fellow bipeds as Europeans and Australians. The relative employment of the characteristics mentioned [courage, perseverance, activity, skill, calculation, and unanimity] will tend to prove whether the bodily and mental powers deteriorate or improve by transplantation, grafting, or seeding; whilst, at the same time, the degree of interest centred in the sport by the on-lookers, will be the criterion by which to judge whether the national love of the attack, strategy, and defence of the *mimic battle* be as strong at the Antipodes as in the mother country.¹

While on the other it emphasised the character and muscle building benefits of the game:

We need hardly say that a devout belief in what the Times [sic.] calls "Muscular Christianity", is part of our creed...the British Aristocracy hold their own, both in the field and the senate house, and that their bitterest enemies...never breathe a suspicion against their courage or their honour...[Compared to the French nobility]...The Englishman of the same class is, from his childhood, an adept in all kind of manly sports...; and when he...enters upon the world, he commences his career with a sound constitution, and a well-ordered mind, equal to any fortune.²

On top of this, it added the all-important ingredient - the Englishness of cricket, for, to *Bell's Life*, cricket was an essential characteristic of the English race, and Victoria was English society transplanted:

Amongst our old English pastimes, cricket has had its due share of support. Every village now through the length and breadth of our adopted land has its cricket club, and the rising generation take to bat and ball as naturally as mother's milk.³

All these characteristics seem to be combined in this comment about cricket and football in Victoria:

Here in Australia, we have found a new home for our race, our religion, our laws, our learning, and our national sports...As season follows season, so sport succeeds to sport; now that cricket is well nigh over, football commences, and we have reason to believe that during the forthcoming winter many pieces of sward in Victoria will be the scene of contests not inferior in interest to those of which Dr.

1 *B.L.V.*, (9 Jan. 1857).

2 *B.L.V.*, (23 April 1859). Of course, Muscular Christianity was only for the right people from the right class: male members of the bourgeoisie.

3 *B.L.V.*, (2 Jan. 1858). What could be more English than the rural idyll of the English village? What could be less Australian? This does, however show how desirable it was to transplant all things English.

These are merely a small selection of a large corpus of comment made in the same vein. A dip into *Bell's Life in Victoria* reveals a plethora of such sentiments, both from the editors, who were profound Muscular Christians, and the correspondents, who aired their ideas and their grievances on a very regular basis.

It is through reading *Bell's Life* that we can surmise that the Melbourne CC regarded itself, and was regarded by others, as the premier club in Victoria and, indeed, the whole of the Australian colonies. Undoubtedly, it attempted to create an image not dissimilar to that of Marylebone and it was certainly at the forefront of attempting to recreate English cricket in Victoria, with the employment of professionals, decisions on the laws of cricket and even an attempt by one of the members to found an Australian I Zingari.² The Melbourne CC was perceived as aristocratic and paternal and their reputation may have been enhanced by the small numbers of people that were admitted into the club. Various instances demonstrate the way in which the Melbourne CC was viewed. In January 1858, a correspondent named 'Point' assessed the position of the Melbourne CC and hoped that they would 'exert their power and influence, verb. sap [sic]',³ while two weeks later, the same correspondent wrote suggesting that the club with the ground it possessed was likely 'to establish it as the antipodeal Marylebone'.⁴ More tellingly, 'A Member Of the Eleven' (of New South Wales), who had just been beaten by Victoria in the preceding match, attempted to explain the difference between cricket in Melbourne and Sydney:

look at the different positions held by the two "elevens". In Melbourne, there is the Melbourne Club, maintained by the élite of the city, many members who never handle a bat, but give their contributions to it as a social institution deserving of support; they have a great land without restrictions, so that they can have a pavilion upon it, and have all the means and appliances of the game ready for practice at five minutes notice; able politicians, the highest in the social scale, the aristocracy of talent, and the aristocracy of wealth, all seem to vie with each other in their patronage of this most manly and scientific of manly sports.⁵

1 *B.L.V.*, (23 April 1858). This, in part shows the huge impact that Hughes's book had made. The book may have been the impetus for the foundation of football in Victoria and surely it is not ironic that one of the founders of Australian Rules, T.W.Wills, was an old Rugbeian himself.

2 This was attempted by T.W.Wills in the late 1850s, but was unsuccessful, resulting in a lot of criticism. As seen above I Zingari was a gentlemen's peripatetic XI that had its origins in the Marylebone CC.

3 *B.L.V.*, (23 Jan. 1858).

4 *B.L.V.*, (6 Feb. 1858).

5 *B.L.V.*, (20 Feb. 1858).

Meanwhile, in August, Hammersley ¹ attacked the inaction of Marylebone, over the much debated laws of cricket, by saying that 'I cannot see why the committee of the Marylebone Club are better judges of the laws of cricket than the committee of Melbourne, or any other good club',² while there were even references to the club's ground being the 'Lord's of this colony'.³

Given the fact that the club had a fairly long standing social tradition that predated the gold rushes and the creation of the colony,⁴ these statements are not surprising. But, if we add to this the fact that they attempted to take a lead in cricket administration, it becomes even less surprising. The inability of the Marylebone CC to act decisively during this period has already been discussed. The repercussions of their procrastination were felt in Victoria, perhaps because of the influx of immigrants, among whom were men like T.W.Wills.⁵ Not only that, but long-standing members of the colony paid visits home,⁶ and *Bell's Life* was assiduous in its publication of important sporting news from Britain. Marylebone's inaction in the face of mounting pressure at home, may have led to the suggestion of the formation of a cricket committee by Hammersley ⁷ for running cricket in Victoria, with the Melbourne CC at its head. Another suggestion was made along these lines by William Fairfax, who suggested a 'congress of cricket' to interpret the laws.⁸ This discussion led to the Melbourne CC calling a conference to obtain unanimity of opinion about Law X, the infamous bowling law. Needless to say, when the conference met Melbourne CC members were prominent and D.S.Campbell was in the chair.⁹ The conference ratified Law X, probably out of deference to their 'superiors' at home, but *Bell's Life* was unsure whether or not the Melbourne CC had the constitutional power to convene such a conference.

1 Educated at Trinity Hall Cambridge during the 1840s and was a cricket blue. In Victoria he became editor of the sport section of *The Australasian*, as well as having a distinguished career as an amateur cricketer during the 50s and 60s.

2 *B.L.V.*, (21 Aug. 1858).

3 *B.L.V.*, (29 Sept. 1860).

4 The colony of Victoria was founded in 1850. From its first settlement in the mid-1830s it had been part of New South Wales, being governed, in the first instance by a Lieutenant-Governor. Separation gave Victoria full autonomy from its neighbour.

5 Born in New South Wales, the son of a wealthy emancipist family, he was educated at Rugby, before returning to Australia. At this time he was probably the best cricketer in the colony.

6 In the 1850s both D.S.Campbell and T.F.Hamilton (both happened to be original founders of the club and also early members of the Melbourne Club) spent some time in England.

7 *B.L.V.*, (8 May 1858).

8 *B.L.V.*, (31 July 1858).

9 *B.L.V.*, (11 Sept. 1858).

The Melbourne CC obviously saw its duty as that of a leader and precedent was on their side. They had inaugurated the first intercolonial match, which had been played between 'The gentlemen of Port Phillip' and 'The gentlemen of Van Diemen's Land' in 1851.¹ Involvement of Melbourne CC members was also a notable feature of the first intercolonial match committee, charged with organising the great cricket matches with New South Wales.² This involvement continued throughout the late 1850s and early 1860s, with the participation of many club members on the committee formed to arrange the visit of the first All-England XI in 1861.³ Furthermore, it was members of the Melbourne CC, who established the company which attempted to secure this visit.⁴ The company failed and Spiers and Pond, the entrepreneurs and restaurant owners, took over the organisation of the venture.

It was logical that the Melbourne CC should be involved in all these areas. They were by nature paternalists, who happened to be some of the leading men of Melbourne. The fact was that if you were a member of the élite and interested in cricket, because of its social footing, there was no choice but to join the Melbourne CC. This is not to say that there was not a cross-section from the ruling class; as will be seen, even at this time, this was an important factor. The next section will examine the historical nature of this through an analysis of biographical data gained on the committee men.

IV

The Committee members and their place within the production and reproduction of Melbourne bourgeois society, 1860-1914

This section will discuss the background from which the committee came and it forms the back-bone to the discussion about the activities of the Melbourne CC, their pretensions towards exclusivity, as well as the domination of Victorian and Australian cricket. Unfortunately, there was no equivalent of *Who's Who* in Australia until the 1920s and few other sources to work from. The writer relied heavily on certain research books, including the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* and its complementary book, the *Biographical Register*, as well as newspaper obituaries and articles. But even using these sources, plus the biographical indexes at the Latrobe library and the files of the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* at the Australian National University, there were many people that proved untraceable and elusive. However, of all information, the most readily available concerned professions and,

1 Dunstan, *The Paddock that Grew*, p.11.

2 Among them were : D.S.Campbell; W.J.Hammersley; T.W.Wills; H.Creswick; W.H.Hull; T.F.Wray; and , Dalmahoy Campbell.

3 *B.L.V.*, (22 Sept. 1860).

4 *B.L.V.*, (12 Jan. 1861). The two men in question were Joseph Raleigh and Henry Daughlish, both solicitors.

over the whole period, information on this subject was gained for about 77% of those who served on the committee. This was fortunate, as in Victorian society an individual's profession was employed as the principal indicator of socio-economic status.

Anyone who was a member of the Melbourne CC had achieved bourgeois status. The fees of the club were never particularly high, for most of this period standing at two guinea a year, with a Two guinea entry fee. This allowed someone with a moderate income to be a member. For example, Davison has an example of a person with an income of £850 a year being a member of the club.¹ This may have been the limit, as the system of proposing and seconding, as well as the black-ball, would have ensured that the membership was kept at a reasonably high level of respectability.² However, acceptance within the club, and service on the committee only tell us that they were members of the dominant class. It does not tell us what place they occupied within that class. Professions go some way to bridging the gap, but it is useful to discover further indicators about each individual, ranging from place of birth and education, to the clubs that each member belonged to, political affiliations they held and religious denominations. Unfortunately, all too often, there was a paucity of information in all these areas, although enough data was discovered to put together a satisfactory, if incomplete, picture.

The organisation of the committee

It was seen earlier how the committee of the Marylebone CC influenced and directed the club. It was demonstrated that the decision making process was a result of the collective ideology of the committee members. At the same time, it was seen that while the committee might not have been representative of the general membership of the club, it was perceived to be the apotheosis of the spirit of the club: aristocratic; autocratic; a benign and sometimes feeble dictatorship. It is now necessary to locate the place of the Melbourne CC committee within the Victorian social structure, for once again this is pivotal to an understanding of the *raison d'être* behind the committee's actions.

The committee of the Melbourne CC remained a remarkably stable institution within the organisational framework of the club. The structure of the committee in 1860 was simple. There were four *ex officio* members - president, vice-president, honorary treasurer and secretary - and seven ordinary committee members. There were also three

1 Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1978), p.207.

2 For details on the blackball, its use and abuse, see below chapter 6 on 'Keeping the club respectable'.

trustees who were entitled to be *ex officio* committee men if they so desired. This rarely occurred and it was not until the 1890s that any trustee chose to exercise this right. Thus there was a basic committee of eleven, which was, in effect, the executive of the club, through which nearly all decisions and many proposals had to be ratified. The members of the committee were expected to serve upon sub-committees, the most important of which was the Match and Ground, although as the number of sports under the umbrella of the Melbourne CC increased so too did the numbers of sub-committees, resulting in many people outside the committee being recruited to serve. All on the general committee, barring the president and vice-presidents, were expected to turn up to meetings unless they were granted leave. In 1860, two members were actually expelled from the body for non-attendance. As people began to realise that membership of the committee meant a dedication to service, this became an increasingly rare occurrence. In this, they were far stricter than the Marylebone CC.¹

Very few structural changes occurred to the body over the period, but the ones that did were not dissimilar to those which occurred at the Marylebone CC. Firstly, in 1877, a paid secretary was appointed in place of the honorary secretary. This was a result of the growth in club business, brought on by the steadily increasing number^{of} international and intercolonial fixtures. This, in turn, resulted in a rise in membership to more than 500 in the mid-1870s. Over the entire period only three men held this office. The first, Curtis Reid, was inefficient and may well have attempted to embezzle subscription money.² Following his dismissal 'Major' Ben Wardill was appointed to the position. He became a dominant force in the club. Efficient and courteous, Wardill managed two Australian XIs (1886 and 1899) on their trips to England, where he made many friends and admirers in the 'right', i.e. Marylebone, circles.³ Interestingly, the

1 The two members were Dr. W.H.Campbell, brother of D.S., and William Randle, a contractor who was involved in the construction of, among other things, the Hobson's Bay Railway. The importance of regular attendance and hard work for the committee were emphasised in the Annual Report of 1865, pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 7 Sept. 1865: 'Your committee trust that the club will make a judicious selection of office-bearers and committee for the ensuing season; and that no gentleman will accept office without fully intending to discharge the duties which will devolve upon them'.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 9 Oct. 1878, accuse him of 'incompetency and want of energy' and being 'lamentably deficient time after time'. After his dismissal, there are several entries threatening Reid with legal action unless he made good the subscription money that had been paid to him but had never reached club funds. See, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 30 June; 7 July; 21 July 1879.

3 Wardill was the son of a Lancastrian stockbroker. Educated at private schools in Lancashire, he came to Melbourne with his brother during the gold-rushes. His brother, R.W., was a prominent member of the club, acting as hon.secretary on several occasions. He resigned from the club in 1872 after a scandal over the embezzlement of £7000 from his employers, the Victorian Sugar Company. Following this he threw himself into the Yarra and drowned. Ben had previously been a clerk in the artillery garrison, as well as a Major in the Harbour Trust Battery.

Australian Dictionary of Biography states that it was Wardill's ambition to make the Melbourne CC the antipodean equivalent of the Marylebone.¹ Wardill retired in 1910, due to ill-health, and was succeeded by Hugh Trumble, one of the great Australian bowlers of his day. He continued the tradition of efficiency and control that Wardill had established. Both Wardill and Trumble were extremely influential figures in the club, in the same way that Perkins and Lacey were at Marylebone, and although the secretary was not allowed a vote on the committee, he was able to shape club policy.

The second change to the structure of the committee was a direct result of the first. Once the position of honorary secretary was abolished, it was deemed desirable to appoint another *ex officio* member to the committee. And so a second position of vice-president was created. The final important change in this period occurred in 1913, when the number of members on the general committee were increased from 7 to 10. The significance of this lies in the fact that the membership of the club had risen to 3500 full members, as well as more than 2000 Country and Junior members. While the committee was elected by a membership of between 100 and 300, the small general committee must have seemed quite representative. That figure had multiplied tenfold by the beginning of the twentieth century, as had club business, thus, in effect, making the small Melbourne CC committee a far more exclusive body in relation to the number of club members than it had been in the early years, despite the increase of 1913.

On the face of it, it appears that the Melbourne CC committee was more open to members than the Marylebone, not least because all positions were elected every year and all members of the club were allowed to stand for election to the committee. However, this is an illusion. The Melbourne CC committee was relatively more exclusive than its London counterpart. Unlike Marylebone there was no rule that required members to retire on the basis of rotation.² Equally, *ex officio* officers were never challenged once they had been put up for election by the committee. To be sure, anyone who was a member of the club could stand for the committee, but it was very difficult to get elected unless the candidate was popular. Those most likely to gain admission to the committee room, were members who were, or had been, successful cricketers and happened to be socially acceptable to boot. Men like William Bruce, a successful club, colony and occasional international cricketer, and Hugh Trumble topped the poll year after year, while others attempted unsuccessfully to be voted onto

1 *A.D.B.*, Vol.6, p.356. There does not seem to be any documentary evidence on this score.

2 This idea was actually put to the committee at the Annual Meeting of 1880, where Daniel Wilkie and W.J.Hammersley introduced a motion that would have meant that not more than four members of the retiring committee would be eligible for re-election onto the committee for the year immediately following the expiration of their term of office. The motion was withdrawn. See *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 Sept. 1880.

the body. Some, like Norman Bayles in the 1890s, tried many times before the call eventually came and others never managed to succeed in their ambition. By the 1890s the selection of 'suitable' candidates was ensured by the printing of their credentials on a list which was displayed for some time before elections took place. Therefore, it was possible to see what profession they were involved in and where they practised it. The members of the club could reassure themselves that the candidates were socially acceptable.

The Melbourne CC committee was in reality a closed book for most people. A close-knit body was cultivated and perpetuated, with the new members who proved to be particularly diligent being groomed for long careers. This resulted in only 121 men serving on the committee over the period 1860-1914. Of these, twenty-four served on the body for over ten years,¹ and some of them, like W.H.Handfield and H.C.A.Harrison, had careers that spanned over thirty years.² From the 1880s committees changed only a very small number of people every year, often due to deaths or the member moving away from Melbourne. Notably, the average age of the committees increased year by year over the period 1890-1910, a sign that the membership of this body was remaining relatively static.³ Despite reservations about these figures, it is obvious that the trend was upwards, as new recruits were generally in the 30-40 year old age bracket. But equally significant was the creation of a new order towards the end of the period. Several members were elected in the years before 1914 and continued to serve upon the Melbourne CC committee for at least 20 years. Among these were: Sir Leo Cussen, high court judge, elected president in 1907, a position held until the 1920s; E.F.Mitchell, K.C., son of early member, Sir

1 H.S.Barlow; W.C.Biddle; W.Bruce; V.L.Cameron; D.S.Campbell; W.J.Clarke; C.Forrester; A.W.Fraser; T.F.Hamilton; W.H.Handfield; H.C.A.Harrison; D.C.McArthur; W.McBean; J.McLaughlin; E.F.Mitchell; T.F.Morkham; F.G.Moule; W.H.Moule; C.Pleasance; A.F.Robinson; C.H.Ross; F.G.Smith; J.Travis; R.W.Wardill.

2 Handfield: 1861-91; Harrison: 1871-1924.

3 There are some problems with these figures that were not surmountable, but do little to change the substance of this argument. Figures were taken at 5 yearly intervals. In 1890-91, 8/11 members ages were discovered. The average age was 43.5 years old, although it may have been higher because of the 3 'unknowns', 2 were F.G.Moule and W.H.Handfield, both very long-standing members, and both about to die in that year. In 1895-96, 10/12 was known and the average age was 46.2 years. Again this figure might be different if the 2 'unknowns' were known, especially as they were both newcomers to the body and therefore more likely to be in 30-40 year old age range, which suggests that the average figure is too high. In 1900-01, the figure was up to 47.2, gathered from 10/14. This may have been accurate as there were 6 members of the 1895-96 body, of which 3 were above average while 2 remained 'unknown'. In 1905-06, the average was 52.5 from 10/12, while in 1910-11 from 9/12 the average was 55.7. In the later case there were 2 new members whose ages were unknown, but who may have well pulled the average down. Nevertheless, as can be seen the conditions for examining these figures are similar for each of the years and there is a definite upward trend during this period.

W.H.F.Mitchell, originally elected in 1905 and was to serve as club president 1933-41; Dr.Ramsay Mailer, elected to the committee in 1906 and followed Mitchell as president in the years 1941-44; Dr.W.C.McClelland, son of an Irish teacher, admitted to the committee 1910 and followed Mailer as president and served until his death in the 1950s; and, Dr.E.J.Cordner, first elected to the body in 1911, but served until his death in 1930 and founded a dynasty of servants to the club, best seen in the present club president who is his grandson.¹ Given that Trumble served as secretary until the 1930s and was succeeded by V.S.Ransford, first elected to the committee in 1913, as well as Harrison who served as club elder until his death in 1929, the committee of the club became more closed and a more self-perpetuating élite as time went by.

Social indicators

The biographical data for members of the Melbourne CC committee was dealt with in a similar way to the Marylebone CC. One committee was taken every five-years in an attempt to illustrate the process of change that occurred over an extended period of time. This had several distinct advantages, not least in that it took into account the most significant members of the Melbourne CC committees, who served for longer periods of time and were thus more important to the organisation of the club. The data is organised on a series of tables which deal with each social indicator. The social indicators are based around birthplace, education, occupation and profession, clubs, political and religious beliefs. It is believed that this range of biographical data yields an insight into the class and status position of members of the emerging dominant class in Victoria and therefore locates the Melbourne CC committee members within that structure. Of these indicators, it is argued that occupational data (Tables 5.3 a-c) is the most revealing.

¹ The present president is Dr. Donald Cordner. Like his father he was educated at the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School and went into one of the top Melbourne professions. As a young man he was a celebrated footballer for the Melbourne Football Club. It is notable that his son was also educated at the Grammar School and plays for the Football Club.

Table 5.1: Birthplace of committee members by five-yearly intervals (%)

Table 5.1a Committee members born in the British isles as a percentage, at five-yearly intervals

Year	England	Ireland	Scotland	Britain ₂	Total (%) ₃
1860/1	42.9	7.1	7.1		57.1
1865/6	50.0		8.3	16.7	75.0
1870/1	54.5			18.2	72.7
1875/6	16.7	16.7		16.7	50.0
1880/1	27.3			9.1	36.4
1885/6	9.1	9.1	9.1	18.2	45.4
1890/1	9.1			18.2	27.3
1895/6	18.2			9.1	27.3
1900/1	14.3				14.3
1905/6	16.7				16.7
1910/1	16.7			8.3	25.0
1913/4	7.1				7.1
Mean (%) ⁴	23.5	2.7	2.0	9.5	37.8

Sources: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Table 5.1b Percentage of Committee members born in Australia, at five-yearly intervals

Year	Vic.	N.S.W.	V.D.L.	Total (%)
1860/1		7.1		7.1
1865/6				
1870/1				
1875/6	8.3		16.7	25.0
1880/1	9.1	9.1	18.2	36.4
1885/6		9.1	18.2	27.3
1890/1	18.2	18.2		36.4
1895/6	27.3	9.1		36.4
1900/1	21.4	14.3		35.7
1905/6	25.0	25.0		50.0
1910/1	25.0	8.3		33.3
1913/4	35.7	7.1		42.9
Mean (%)	14.2	8.9	4.4	27.5

Sources: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Key: Vic.=Victoria; N.S.W.= New South Wales; V.D.L.=Van Diemen's Land.

1 G. Serle, *The Rush to be Rich*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1971), p.2, comments that 'Victoria's history in the late nineteenth century must be written in terms of the migrant generation of the fifties who continued to dominate through the eighties, when most of their children were coming of age'. This demonstrates, in part, the importance of birthplace. Nevertheless, it does underestimate the significance of the pastoralists and other original founders of Port Phillip. Later, p.228-9, he does note the growing importance of the native born; presumably these were the children of the emigrants of the fifties. Again this tends to ignore the original founders.

2 Represents those who were born in the British Isles, but whose exact country of birth is unknown.

3 Percentage of the committee who were born in the British isles.

4 Mean percentage of the committee born in each category over the 12 selected years.

Table 5.1c: Summary of data.

Year	Brit.	Aus.	U.S.A	Unknown ¹	Total
1860/1	57.1	7.1		35.7	100
1865/6	75.0		8.3	16.7	100
1870/1	72.7			27.3	100
1875/6	50.0	25.0		25.0	100
1880/1	36.4	36.4		27.3	100
1885/6	45.4	27.3		27.3	100
1890/1	27.3	36.4	9.1	27.3	100
1895/6	27.3	36.4	9.1	27.3	100
1900/1	14.3	35.7		50.0	100
1905/6	16.7	50.0		33.3	100
1910/1	25.0	33.3		41.7	100
1913/4	7.1	42.9		50.0	100
Mean (%)	37.8	27.5	2.2	32.4	100

Sources: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Data for place of birth was not as extensively available as might have been wished, although much sense can be made from an analysis of located returns. There appears to be a gradual shift among committee members away from those born in Britain. The figure for native born Australians gradually increases, as the second generation started to make its mark in Victoria. Thus, in 1875, two men were born in Van Diemen's Land and one in Victoria. Notably the two were both sons of eminent pastoralists and over-straiters: W.J.Clarke, son of Sir W.J.T. 'Big' Clarke; and, Andrew Loughnan, son of Peter Loughnan. The 1890s saw the inclusion of an increasing numbers of committee members born in Victoria or Australia, an indication of the rise to prominence of the colonial born in Victorian society. Of the 14 people on the 1913-14 committee 6 of the 7 with known birthplaces were native Australians. The 1 Briton happened to be E.F.Mitchell, who came to the colony at an early age with his father Sir W.H.F.Mitchell. Of the unknowns, it is possible that many of them were born in Australia. For instance, 3 were educated in Victoria, which suggests that if their birthplace was not antipodean, they were extremely young on arrival.

The most notable observation that can be made about the birthplace data is that it mirrors overall trends in Victorian society.² However, it should be pointed out that one might have expected to find more people whose origins lay in the Port Phillip era and more who were descended from the significant pastoral families. Thus, one might have expected to discover a relatively high proportion of members in the data set born either in the Port Phillip district, Van Diemen's Land, or the pastoral areas of New South

¹ All committee members with an unknown birthplace.

² Serle, *The Rush to be Rich*, p.229, notes the growing importance of the native born in political terms with, in 1894, 37 native-born members of parliament out of a total of 95.

Wales. This would have confirmed early claims about the social superiority of the club. Apart from T.F.Hamilton, who served in the 1860s as president and then became a trustee for many years, it was not until men like Clarke, Loughnan and D.S.Wallace were elected onto the committee in the 1870s that any representatives of the homespun pastoral oligarchy appeared. Even then, this group was never well represented, with people like Stuart McArthur, son of Peter, and the aforementioned Mitchell, being the exceptions rather than the rule.

Education (Table 5.2)

Education provides an insight into the aspirations of the families of individual committee members. If, for example, a member was educated at an English public school and was born in Australia, we can conclude that the family in question regarded itself as a member of the élite. More often, however, and especially in the latter part of this period, members were schooled in Australia. These schools were established as a reproduction of the English public school system, which was itself still in the process of creation. And while the emulation was not perfect, as in ^{the} case of Scotch College where prefects were not introduced until the beginning of the twentieth century, attempts were definitely made to forge these schools in the image of the 'Arnoldian' system. The evidence is plain to see in the bellicose school songs, and the emphasis placed by such headmasters as L.A.Adamson of Wesley College and A.B.Weighall of Sydney Grammar on character building and the games ethic.¹ In the colonies, the

1 Macintyre, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.4, p.60; Kingston, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.3, p.202; Clark, C.M.H.Clark, *History of Australia*, Vol.4, p.290. An interesting example of the process of founding these schools and invention of tradition is seen in the case of Haileybury College, which was established in 1891. The school was founded by Charles Rendall, an ex-pupil of Haileybury College in England. He also happened to be the brother of philathlete Montagu Rendall, at that time a master of Winchester, but who became headmaster in 1911 (see Mangan, *The Games Ethic*, pp.28-33). Unsurprisingly the school was modelled on Haileybury in England and the public school system in general. He was a classicist who had originally worked at Scotch College and, it is claimed, his mission was to produce 'English Gentlemen'. He was a fanatical believer in the powers of cricket too. (I am very grateful to Dr.D.Chambers, who lent me the manuscript of his forthcoming book on the history of the Melbourne Haileybury). This process was common particularly in relation to the use of games and the games ethic, a fact confirmed by G.Inglis, *Sport and Pastimes in Australia*, (Methuen, London 1912). He dedicated a whole chapter to the subject (ch.10), commenting favourably on A.B.Weighall of Sydney Grammar who came to Australia full of 'B.N.C.[Brasenose College] traditions' (p.132). The school songs in J.Beacham Kiddle (ed.), *Liber Melburniensis - Melbourne Church of England Grammar School, 1848-1936*, (Robertson and Mullers, Melbourne 1937), pp.651-675, an anthology of MCEGS songs, are further confirmation of the reproduction of English values in an Australian context. Included in these is the 'School Games Song' (pp.674-75) which has a 'War Verse'. By the time of publication of the 1936 *Liber Melburniensis*, the traditions surrounding Melbourne's public schools had become well established, with Scotch College claiming that 'it stood for tradition...The public school taught a boy to improve himself for the sake of his school and later for the sake of his country'. *Argus*, (8 Oct. 1934), p.8.

specific purpose of these schools was to train young men for a life in the professions. But bearing in mind the potential which these institutions gave for solidifying the élite groups and socialising young men into the upper class, it is safe to assume that enrolment was equivocal with bourgeois status. Thus, in many cases it marked attempts by families to cement and/or establish their position within the wider social network of the dominant class. If, for example, a committee member was educated at a school like Melbourne Church of England Grammar, or Geelong grammar, it is possible to deduct that the family either belonged to an élite group, or aspired to one.¹ Equally, if we discovered that a member of the committee had been sent to Melbourne University, or for that matter Oxford or Cambridge, it would be possible to surmise that his family were grooming him for high professional or social status.²

Table 5.2: Education of Committee members at five-yearly intervals (%)

Year	P.S.Melb.	P.S.Brit.	Other	Unknown
1860/1			14.3	85.7
1865/6			25.0	75.0
1870/1		9.1	9.1	81.8
1875/6	16.7	8.3	8.3	66.7
1880/1	18.2	9.1	18.2	54.5
1885/6	27.3		9.1	63.6
1890/1	54.5			45.5
1895/6	63.6		9.1	27.3
1900/1	50.0			50.0
1905/6	41.7			58.3
1910/1	50.0		8.3	41.7
1913/4	57.1		7.1	35.7
Mean (%)	31.6	2.2	9.0	57.2

Sources: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Key: P.S.Melb.= Public School in Melbourne³; P.S.Brit.=Public School in Britain; Other= Other known educational institution.⁴

1 Likewise with the other Melbourne schools of which Scotch, Wesley, St.Patrick's/Xavier and Hawthorn, were the most important. To this list must be added Geelong College. All these institutions were denominational, representing Presbyterian, Methodist and Catholic faiths. However, with the exception of Xavier, the schools tended to be slightly less closed than this suggests. It was not necessary for denominational divisions to be observed religiously. For example, there are instances where pupils were removed from the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School and placed at Presbyterian Scotch, while a glance at the Scotch school register reveals many Jewish names.

2 Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, p.95. Melbourne University started to provide a limited range of professional courses. By the end of the nineteenth century instead of being sent to Britain lawyers and doctors were increasingly trained in Melbourne.

3 Public School is being used here to refer to those schools which were an imitation of British Public Schools. It should be pointed out that in Australia they would now be referred to as private schools. Public school normally means a state-run institution.

4 Where these schools were known they were usually small private schools independent of the state.

Despite the absence of a complete run of data, the pattern of education (Table 5.2) is very similar to the pattern of birthplace. In the early years little is known about the committee members' education with odd exceptions, which usually relate to single individuals. Significantly, few were educated at the 'great' English public schools, despite the presence in the club of Old Etonians like the Rev. Fellowes. This was because the English public school system only took off during the mid-nineteenth century and many of those serving on the committee were of an age when, if born in Britain of 'respectable' parentage, they would either be educated at home by a tutor, or would have attended a small private school. This was the case with R.W.Wardill and his brother Ben, as well as Henry Creswick and F.G.Smith, whose father actually ran such a school in Middlesex. Those that did attend English public schools were usually born and educated in Britain, A.F.Robinson being a case in point.¹

The Australian system of private schools took off in the 1860s and then it was not on an organised or rationalised basis. Their development appears to be almost contiguous with similar developments in Britain. Thus, in the early years of settlement, prior to the founding of the 'great' grammar schools and their other denominational counterparts, there were numerous small-scale private schools which serviced the élite groups. This was reflected in the committee, with W.J.Clarke educated at Bonwick's Academy in Hobart and D.S.Wallace educated at Charles Goslett's Academy in Melbourne. But from the 1870s, the first pupils from the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School and Scotch College start appearing on the committee. This is a trend which becomes increasingly apparent over time, with growing numbers attending these schools. By 1890, 6 out of the 6 'knowns' were educated at either of the schools, while in 1913 8 out of 9 'knowns' were a product of the same educational background. Of course, if data was known on more of the committee members this figure might have been considerably higher over the final thirty years of the period. Unlike Britain, only the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School has complete and extensive registers, leaving one at the mercy of incomplete and confusing lists of names for the other schools.

It is probable that some of the 'unknowns' would have been sent 'home' to be educated. J.P.Tennent was at Cambridge University, but his brothers were sent to Loretto and Merchiston Castle, in Edinburgh. This may have been true of others, but verification would require a long and possibly fruitless search through hundreds of school registers. It would appear that enrolment in British institutions declined as the Australian equivalents of Eton and Harrow were increasingly recognised by Victorians as important places of élite integration. In other words, once these schools became part

¹ Robinson was educated at Marlborough.

of the bourgeois 'network', and could thus act as agents of socialisation and élite integration, it was unnecessary and even unwise for members of this class to send their children 'home'. This point was reached at a fairly early date accounting for the rapid increase of Melbourne educated men on the committee.

As far as University education was concerned a similar pattern is revealed. While there are few figures for those educated at University, there is evidence of certain people being sent 'home' to Oxford and Cambridge, the above mentioned J.P.Tennent being an example. But there were not many in this category. Martin Irving, headmaster of Hawthorn and Wesley Colleges, was educated at Balliol. But, this was an example of an emigration pattern rather than a decision by a colonial family to 'despatch' their son home. Irving came to the colonies as a result of his education, coming out specifically as a teacher. Others were sent 'home', but not to the universities. E.F.Mitchell went to London to study in the Inner Temple, as did T.A.Beckett. Dr. R.Mailer completed his studies for medicine in Britain, at Edinburgh University.¹ But by the later period, it was far more common for committee members to complete their tertiary education in Victoria, usually at Melbourne University.

This places the club committee somewhere in the middle of the Melbourne dominant class in terms of social status. There were not enough men who had been educated at the 'great' British schools or universities to place them in the top rungs of the élite. But the numbers who attended the Melbourne private schools in the later part of this period suggests that there was a fairly high level of integration within ruling/power élites on the committee.

Profession and Occupation (Table 5.3 a-c)

Unlike Britain, few men in Victoria could claim the status of 'gentleman',² having not sullied their hands with the dirt of work and money. There seemed to be no class that directly replicated that of Britain's landed aristocracy. This did not mean that class did not exist and membership of the upper class was ascribed by a combination of factors, including the way in which any given individual earned his/her living. This factor, in itself, represented the social and economic power of each person.

The economy of Victoria was originally based upon agricultural pursuits and commerce, the economic pillars of pre-industrial British society. Gold brought a large inflow of labour, but it did not alter the fact that Victoria's wealth was based upon the primary resources of the land, the entrepreneurial activity of its merchants and the

¹ I am grateful to Larry Geary, Dept. of Economic and Social History, University of Edinburgh, for information on Dr.R.Mailer's educational career in Edinburgh.

² Interestingly, from 1896, H.C.A.Harrison claimed the status of 'gentleman' following his retirement from the civil service.

development of the infrastructure of the city.¹ This was the economic basis for Victoria's early ruling class. The first people who were recognised as the heads of society were the pastoralists, including the Henty's, the first over-straiters,² the Armytage's and the Clarke's.³ The second group who were perceived as 'leaders' of society were the merchants.⁴ It was these men who made Melbourne the entrepôt of the Australian sub-continent, a position they held until the agents from overseas firms supplanted them in the 1880s. If initially a merchant was from an 'inferior' social background, it took him many years to rival the social prestige of the pastoralists, but this status could be attained by following an upward path through such organisations as

1 As well as the exploitation of her work-force.

2 That is, the first people to come over to the Port Phillip district from Van Diemen's Land. The expression 'over-straiter' refers to anyone who crossed the Bass Straits to occupy land in the area that became Victoria in 1850. The over-straiters were the first white settlers of the area (bar a doomed convict settlement in 1803 and a lone convict thereafter), and started arriving in 1835. A second wave of migration occurred at the end of the decade from New South Wales. These settlers had been inspired by Major Mitchell's Australia Felix expedition which had travelled through the heart of the district and had reported on its pastoral potential. These were the 'overlanders'. There were tensions in the early history of the district between these two groups. For a full description see de Serville, *Port Phillip Gentlemen*, chs. 1-2.

3 To de Serville, *Port Phillip Gentlemen*, the pastoralists were the crème de la crème of Melbourne society. This view is also held by G.Bolton, 'The Idea of a Colonial Gentry', *Historical Studies*, Vol.13, (1968), pp.307-28, who believed that the pastoralists attempted to create a colonial gentry with many of the trappings of the gentry class in England. Both of them have a narrow conception of what goes to make a 'gentleman' in colonial society, and the fact is that the 'gentleman' class was much wider than either give it credit. J.Hirst, 'Egalitarianism', in S.L.Goldberg, F.B.Smith (eds.), *Australian Cultural History*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988), pp.58-77, argues for a wider definition. He believes that there was a widening of the ranks of gentlemen in the colonies because in Britain gentlemanly status itself had a degree of ambiguity because it did not only include the possession of land and an ancient family, but also of certain virtues such as honesty and considerateness. In Australia, where there was less intra-generational social closure there was necessarily more concentration on the virtues, especially as everyone had to work and earn money (p.62). Significant for this section of the project he concludes that ' "gentleman" became the status of anyone holding a certain position in the occupational hierarchy or possessing independent means'. This is good as far as it goes. However, as has been argued here, status within a class is also an important part of this type of social formation and thus membership of voluntary associations, clubs etc. can be every bit as important as position in the occupational spectrum.

4 Hirst, 'Egalitarianism', p.62, argues that merchants were accepted as 'gentlemen' at an early date. But he also argues, somewhat ambiguously, that they were 'socially' inferior to pastoralists, although some of them were accepted into the élite clubs from an early date. As will be seen below this confuses the nature of class and status. It was possible for a merchant to be socially acceptable depending on what type of merchant he was. Equally, merchants and pastoralists were sometimes indistinguishable. The whole question of the social status and class position of a merchant could be defined by his place within the structure of gentlemanly capitalism. Thus, a banker, or a financier, whose jobs relied on trust and honour could be regarded as gentlemen. Likewise some mercantile capitalists. Their social status is in part defined by their job practices. For a full discussion of gentlemanly capitalism, see Cain, Hopkins, 'Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Expansion Overseas, I. The Old Colonial System, 1688-1850', pp.501-25.

the Mechanic's Institute (later The Athenaeum), the St.Kilda Volunteers, the Victorian Club and the Melbourne CC, until they reached the refined and gentlemanly atmosphere of the Melbourne Club and the more public arena of the conservative Legislative Council. Such men included F.T.Sargood and James Service. Once their position was endangered by the new agent's system, rather than using the aegis of the Victorian traders, many withdrew to an idle life in the countryside, buying property and withdrawing from the hectic world of trade.¹

There were other ways individuals could consolidate their position or progress through the ranks of the élite in relation to occupations, the most popular proving to be the professions. The professions were extremely important to Melbourne and Davison demonstrates in *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, that the growth of the city was in part due to the expansion of professional and managerial activity. This was associated with a large increase in all professions, as well as management and commerce, literally feeding on itself to create the conditions whereby such an economic boom could take place. Significantly, he identifies a crucial question frequently asked by members of the upper class: 'what shall we do with our boys?'. He concludes that the usual answer was 'get them professional training'.² This demonstrates that many of those entering the professions would have been born within the hallowed cradle of the colony's upper class, but a few others could reach the hallowed ground by climbing a mountain of professional preferment. It was possible to raise social status by becoming a barrister, solicitor, doctor or architect. But with rare exceptions, the people who became professionals were recruited from a background which was essentially bourgeois. The primary prerequisite for a successful professional was capital, usually in the form of family wealth. This provided access to the necessary education and training opportunities, as well as to the establishment^{of} a successful practice. Family and education placed the individual in a network, which gave access to wealthy clients and business contacts. The very fact that it was necessary to have capital to achieve these positions emphasises that the vast majority of those with professional qualifications were drawn from the élite. The exceptions were notable men, like barristers Sir Leo Cussens, who climbed from his father's grocery store to the dizzy heights of the Victorian and Federal bench and Henry Bourne Higgins, whose humble origins were similar to those of Cussens and who also followed a distinguished career. Both eventually achieved the status of Melbourne Club members, but their 'success'

1 Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, pp.19-40. By the late 1870s, foreign manufacturers were increasingly financing exports themselves, rather than Melbourne merchants buying goods from abroad, as had been the case since the 1850s. Instead, the foreign exporters placed agents in Melbourne and this system challenged and led to the downfall of the old system.

2 Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, p.96.

obscures the fact that the path of advancement was rocky and difficult. For every member born outside the *élite*, their must have been at least five E.F.Mitchell's, Thomas A'Beckett's and Stuart McArthur's born into it.¹

Within the professions there was a definite hierarchy, with law and medicine at the top. Barristers and judges were the foremost of these, with a good barrister being able to make over £5000 a year and often much more. Initially these men were trained in Britain, as much a result of their privileged background, as the lack of training facilities in Melbourne. They would be called to the bar in the Inns of Court and then would return to Melbourne with the cachet of having studied in the rarified atmosphere of Inner Temple or Lincoln's Inn. Soon, however, opportunities for training in Melbourne itself became available with the establishment of the university in 1853. By the end of the nineteenth century it was not regarded as a disability to have trained in the colonies rather than London. The same was true of medicine, although the tradition of wealthy pupils being sent home to the great hospitals of Britain, especially Edinburgh, continued for some time.

Next down on the professional ladder were solicitors, architects, engineers, dentists, surveyors, pharmacists and accountants, all of whom required the requisite capital and training to establish themselves. The majority of these professions were undoubtedly regarded as respectable, although there was more than a degree of ambiguity about the social status of architects during the property boom years. Most of the professions attempted to erect barriers to entry, which, in effect, made them more exclusive. Within each professional occupation there was a social hierarchy, defined by three factors.² Firstly, the individual's position within the firm/practice/institution that he worked for. Thus, someone who was a partner held more prestige than someone who was not. Secondly, attributes that were ascribed to each individual. Thus, it was possible that someone who was not a partner had high social status due to birth within an *élite* group. In this instance, they might be relatively young and might not have had, at that time, the necessary experience or the capital to attain the position of partner etc. Thirdly, there was the matter of the esteem in which any given individual was held by his peer group, which might add to, or detract from, any social and/or professional rank/honour that the individual held.

There were other occupations that were socially acceptable, but did not require the vocational training of the professions. Most of these were involved in finance and

1 All three of whom came from the upper class of Victoria. All three were eminent lawyers. 2, Mitchell and McArthur, came from pastoralist/squattocracy backgrounds, while A'Beckett, was from a prominent and well established legal family. All were brought up in Australia and all were members of the cricket club.

2 This is as true of Bar and Medicine, as it is of the other professions.

business, although it was also perfectly acceptable to work as a civil administrator/servant. In finance, the respectable positions were in stockbroking and the stock-exchange, although a career in banking, as in the professions, might mean a number of different things. A bank manager would have been regarded as a significant cornerstone of the community, as he effectively controlled the purse-strings of the neighbourhood and thus epitomised local 'respectability', without being a big cog in the Melbourne elite.¹ A banker who directed one of the large city/colonial banks, held a position which generated prestige that few other professions could rival in Australian society. A classic example of this was F.G.Smith, president of the Melbourne CC during the 1890s.²

Other occupations that provided bourgeois respectability were in business/commerce. Again, this depended upon similar factors to those which applied to the professions. The business had to be conducted upon the right scale, disqualifying corner-store owners, and as always it helped if the person in question was born into the right class and had the right education. This in itself was enough to exclude some of the biggest commercial entrepreneurs, despite their obvious economic power, from the upper ranks of society, due to their lack of social cachet, or through having some other social disability. In the case of Sidney Meyer, owner of the great Melbourne department store, the effect of Melbourne's prevailing anti-semitism was enough to exclude him from the Melbourne Club. Others like A.F.Robinson,³ Melbourne CC committee member, obviously had an advantage by being educated at the right type of institution, in his case Marlborough College, and was able to penetrate the exclusive enclave of the Melbourne Club.

Finally, the last occupation that held the prestige of bourgeois acceptability and placed the individual automatically in the elite, was the civil service and government administration. If one was senior enough within these areas social rewards might be forthcoming. Service as a high ranking administrator might place the individual near the socially important figure of the Governor. At the very least it put one in touch with the powers of government. More importantly, such a position was usually gained through patronage, a system that enabled those who were well connected to benefit at the expense of others. For much of this period patronage was an important feature of the

1 Macintyre, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.4, p.49.

2 Smith became chairman of the Associated Banks in 1888 and successfully steered the National Bank of Australasia through the dramatic crises of the 1890s. His illustrious social position was illustrated by his presidency of the Melbourne Club in 1891.

3 Born in London in 1851, he arrived in Adelaide in 1872, but subsequently moved to Melbourne where he was employed in commerce. He was a member of the Melbourne Club, but he left the city and went to Sydney in 1885, where he founded Hogg, Robinson and Co.

administration. In Victoria between 1862 and 1882, it has been estimated that only one tenth of the persons entering the public service took the required examination, the rest, about 16,000, being appointed through a system that was, to all intents and purposes, social nepotism.¹ Despite efforts to make the system more meritocratic, patronage remained a marked feature of the Victorian service. Of course, a servant of lesser rank would have been regarded as someone of limited social acceptability and, as with the other professions, it was easier by far to get on if one was born into the right class.

Professions and occupations are extremely good social indicators for Victorian colonial society, not least because they demonstrate how individuals would be regarded by their peers. It was not a matter of social mobility, it was important to bear the right social credentials from birth. It was possible for men, and some women, to climb from lowly origins to the peaks of society, but this was uncommon. At the very least it was necessary to be born into the bourgeoisie, from there it was easier to become a member of the most exclusive élite groups, if this had not been ascribed by birth. It was simpler to be born into the class which held and serviced economic and social power, and then to climb the ladder of social preferment, than it was to be an outsider.²

Table 5.3 reveals the changing nature of the committee, but this change is obviously within the framework of the development of the Victorian economy. There are two occupational categories that stand out: commerce and finance; and urban professional. Compared to these two, pastoralism, such an important feature of the Victorian economy, is relatively insignificant. Nevertheless, this does reflect urban development in the colony and particularly the growth of professions and financial institutions. Most dominant within the two significant categories were legal professions and commerce and banking, while the expansion of accountancy and stockbroking becomes a feature towards the end of the period (See Tables 5.3 a-b). There were, however, significant changes over the period as a whole.

In the 1860s two occupational groupings dominated over all others, pastoralism and commerce. From the early years of the colony, the two main visible pillars of the Victorian economy were pastoralism and trade, providing the faucet through which capital could flow to develop the infrastructure of the city. The latter was, more a less, concomitant with the former. With the gold-rushes these two pillars remained, pastoralism became relatively less important for a while, but commerce and broking remained a fundamental part of the Victorian economy. It is therefore not surprising that in the 1860s the Melbourne CC had men from both areas on the committee. This also

1 Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.111.

2 This section on the professionals was developed from Macintyre, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.4, pp.45-70; Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, pp.95-112; and Kingston, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.3 pp.283-8.

demonstrates the degree of integration that existed within the club at this time between two separate élite groups who were socially disparate. At this time commerce was regarded as a socially inferior occupation to pastoralism. Even if we take into account reservations about this argument, including the fact that in Britain certain types of commerce were socially acceptable and formed the backbone of a haute bourgeoisie, there remains more than an element of truth in this statement. However, in some cases there was no need for integration. For example D.S.Campbell, a stalwart of the committee in the early part of the period, was engaged in commerce but had pastoral interests as well. He had been in partnership with another committee member, Henry Creswick, who was chiefly remembered as a pastoralist, but also dabbled in commerce. Boundaries were blurred and it was perfectly possible for someone who had the right social credentials to be involved in commerce and move within the circles of the Melbourne Club, as well as the Melbourne CC. Nevertheless, there were a number of other people on the committee during these years who were involved in commercial dealings but were not of the same social 'stamp' as Campbell. For example, the auctioneer A.W.Fraser, who took a few years more to establish himself in élite circles, served on the committee during the 1870s, indicating that there was a high degree of social integration between élite groups within the hierarchy of Melbourne CC.

One of the most interesting features about these two occupational groupings is that their importance declines after the 1860s. The decline in the pastoral category is more dramatic than that in commerce, which remains a constant feature of the committee. The pastoral decline is unsurprising, but is not a reflection of economic circumstances. As attendance at committee meetings became more important, those that lived in the bush had little chance of being on the committee. Likewise, by the 1870s Melbourne was fast becoming a metropolis, sprawling across a large area and removing itself from the bush. With this there was a comparative rise of urban professionals and a distinct decline of those involved in pastoralism. The pastoral group remained a feature of the club, but more often than not, their contribution was as country members, who spent only a few weeks in town and were uninvolved in committee business.

Commerce, in the mercantilist sense also declined on the committee in importance, but was replaced by a new type of commerce and finance. The nature of commercial activity changed rapidly over the years. In the 1860s the commercial element of the committee were involved in wine importing and auctioneering. By the turn of the century commerce was a matter of timber broking, finance through raising capital and a number of other activities that were less involved in the importing business and more with manufacturing. Meanwhile, as previously stated, the whole basis of the importing trade had changed, with the rise of the foreign agents system and the decline

of the entrepreneurial trader kings. At the same time, the manufacturing sector had grown. This was a less 'socially' acceptable area of involvement than the old-style commerce and may explain the relative demise of this occupational grouping on the committee. Equally, the importance of financial institutions, in the form of banks and the stock-exchange had increased dramatically. All this can be seen in the evolution of the committee.

Table 5.3a: Occupations of Melbourne CC committee men by five-yearly intervals (%)

Year	A ₁	B ₂	C ₃	D ₄	E ₅	F	TOTAL
1860/1	7	36	7	14		36	100
1865/6	23	31	16			30	100
1870/1		36	36		9	19	100
1875/6	17	32	26	17		8	100
1880/1	18	27	27			28	100
1885/6	9	18	54			19	100
1890/1		18	81				100
1895/6		42	59				100
1900/1	7	50	21	7	14		100
1905/6		42	25	8	25		100
1910/1		24	42	8	25		100
1913/4	7	21	50	7	14		100
Total (%) ⁶	7.3	31.4	37.0	5.1	7.3	11.7	100

Source: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Key: A=Pastoral Industry; B=Commerce and Finance; C=Urban Professionals; D=Construction
E=Other Known Occupations; F=Unknown/Unspecified.

1 Category A includes: graziers; pastoralists; landowners; and stock and station agents.

2 Category B includes: bankers; brokers; merchants; auctioneers; and accountants.

3 Category C is of wide scope. The most important group is the legal profession: barristers; solicitors; and judges. But the section also includes all those in the administration, as well as emerging professions like pharmacy etc. Accountants are excluded and placed in category B.

4 Category D represents those involved in the construction business and mainly consists of architects and engineers. As much of this period pre-dates the 'professionalization' of both these occupations they have been placed in a category on their own.

5 Category E is for those whose occupations are known but cannot be included in the other sections due to their diversity. This section includes the occasional soldier, a journalist, a jeweller and a 'gentleman'.

6 This figure is the mean of each category over the period and is calculated by adding all the years together and dividing by the number of committees (in this case 12).

Table 5.3b: Urban professionals on the Melbourne CC committee by five-yearly intervals (%)

Year	Law ¹	Admin. ²	Medic. ³	Other ⁴
1860/1			7	
1865/6	8	8		
1870/1	18	18		
1875/6	17	9		
1880/1	18	9		
1885/6	27	18		9
1890/1	45	27		9
1895/6	42	17		
1900/1	21			
1905/6	17	8		
1910/1	25		17	
1913/4	36		14	
Total (%)	22.8	9.5	3.2	1.5

Sources: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*

Table 5.3c: Commerce, business and banking on the Melbourne CC committee at five-yearly intervals (%)

Year	Commerce ⁵	Banking ⁶	Accounts. ⁷	Stock. ⁸
1860/1	36			
1865/6	31			
1870/1	27	9		
1875/6	24	8		
1880/1	18	9		
1885/6	9	9		
1890/1	9	9		
1895/6	17	8	17	
1900/1	14	7	29	
1905/6	18	8	8	8
1910/1	8		8	8
1913/4	7	7		7
Total (%)	18.1	6.2	5.2	1.9

Source: Various incl. *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*

1 Lawyers: judges; barristers; and solicitors.

2 Admin. includes all men serving in the higher ranks of the Victorian civil service.

3 Medic. is anyone qualified as a doctor in medicine.

4 Other represents 1 person who was a pharmacist

5 Includes merchants, brokers and auctioneers.

6 Exclusive to senior bankers.

7 Accountants.

8 Stockbrokers.

As a result of this phenomenon, urban professionals became an important part of the fabric of the Melbourne bourgeoisie and once again this is demonstrated by changes which occurred on the club committee. By the 1890s many of the committee members were urban professionals. The rapid rise in such occupations as accountancy can be perceived in the changing social composition of the committee, as well as in society at large.¹ Meanwhile, the more traditional legal professions, remained a constant and important group. As stated above, Melbourne was a city that was in part created by the vast rise in professions and bureaucracy and it is significant that from the 1870s this rise is reflected in the committee of the cricket club. The two most prestigious professions were barrister and doctor and the committee had its share of these men. High ranking barristers who served on the body included W.H.Moule, who became a judge, E.F.Mitchell, S.McArthur and T.A.Beckett, all of whom scaled the heights of their profession. With doctors the case is slightly different. In the early years there were two doctors, one of whom, Dr.W.H.Campbell, was socially prestigious, being the brother of D.S., and a member of the Melbourne Club. The two doctors in the later period seem to ^{have} less social status at this time. Neither doctors Mailer nor MacLelland were members of the Melbourne Club before 1914.

This actually demonstrates a particular problem in any skills classification. It is desirable for the purposes of classification, to place people in sub-groups, like the law. This group is actually very diverse, including judges, barristers, solicitors and legal managers. Within this scale there is a definite status hierarchy, with potentially a vast difference between occupations in both authority/status and earnings.² For example, it is a commonplace that barristers carry more social cachet than solicitors, which is in part a reflection of the more rigorous barriers to entering the profession. This can be seen within the Melbourne CC itself. In the year 1890, 5 members of the committee were involved in the law. Their occupational profile spans a fairly wide band of the social/status spectrum. There were F.G.Moule and James McLaughlin, both of whom were prominent solicitors, and both of whom were members of the Melbourne Club.³ There was also Moule's son W.H., who was a barrister, another member of the exalted

1 Accountancy was a profession that was singled out as being a significant growth area during the 1890s by Davison, *Marvellous Melbourne*, p.97. He gives these figures for the growth of accountancy: In 1891 there were 21 registered; in 1901 there were 354.

2 The issue can be further complicated. For example, frequently people will volunteer one description of their profession which implies social status for a census return, and another which is a technical specification for a trade directory. Of course, this is more likely to occur with skilled artisans etc. but is not irrelevant to professionals. In Victoria, the division between barrister and solicitor was dismantled in the 1890s although in practice it still remained. The status of a barrister was generally higher than a solicitor, but what was the self-elected status of someone who describes themselves as a lawyer?

3 Both of whom owned their own extensive practices.

club, and was eventually to become a judge. We see W.Bruce, who while he was not the most important of Melburnian solicitors, was a respected and famous cricketer. The final representative of the legal group was W.Ryall, a legal manager, and apparently of a different social status to the others. In general, the legal sub-group on the committee was from the prestigious end of dominant class society, but there was a degree of social openness which enabled other members of the dominant class from a lower status background to be members.

This is confirmed by an examination of other occupational groupings. While many of the presidents were among the most important bankers in Victoria and therefore socially significant people, it is also possible to find small-scale bank managers like Hugh Trumble, who had reached the committee as a result of cricketing prowess rather than high social status.¹ Equally, in the shape of William McBean, there was a jeweller and therefore a craftsman. His business was large and bounteous, but it is interesting to note that he still kept the occupational title of 'jeweller', suggesting pride in his craft. However, in the civil administration there were some of the most important members of the committee, including W.H.Handfield and H.C.A.Harrison. Handfield served on the body from the 1860s to his death in 1891. He was from a respectable Anglican Ascendancy family, his brother was the well-known Melburnian vicar, the Rev.H.H.P.Handfield. W.H. was in the Victorian Education Department and he served as chief clerk for many years. This was a relatively prestigious administrative position. If we are to take the description of J.F.Archibald seriously, he was undoubtedly a 'gentleman'.² H.C.A.Harrison, who served on the committee from the 1870s until his death in 1929, pursued a notable career in the civil service, first in the Customs Office and then in ^{the} Titles Department. By his retirement in the 1890s he was openly styling himself a 'gentleman'. Thus judges, legal managers, stockbrokers, bankers, jewellers and civil servants, while separated by occupational status, as well as different economic positions, mingled on the Melbourne CC committee.

The question has to be asked whether the professional profile of the club was representative of Melbourne bourgeois society. From a purely chronological point of view this is definitely the case. The decline in importance of pastoralism and mercantile

1 Trumble was however sent to Hawthorn Grammar. His father was a teacher. His brother became a solicitor.

2 Archibald recorded an incident when he was working as a junior clerk in the same department. During the Berry ministry Handfield was sacked, a result of the massive cuts that occurred on 'Black Wednesday', which were caused by the deadlock between the radical Berry ministry and the conservative Legislative Council, which was refusing to grant supply. Archibald was pricked by what he saw as an injustice done 'to this old and weary man, whom all around him knew...to be an honourable and kindly gentleman'. Through contacts in the press Archibald campaigned for his reinstatement, a battle that was duly won. See Lawson, *The Archibald Paradox*, pp.23-4.

commerce, and the rise of urban professionals as part of the social fabric of Melbourne, is reflected perfectly on all the Tables. Nevertheless, despite the fact that all committee members were from élite groups, some were in more powerful positions than others and some also had more social status. This, like the other social indicators, suggests that while the élite of Melbourne may have been relatively closed, if they were prepared to serve upon the committee together, it was a well integrated group.

Club (Table 5.4)

Social clubs are another good indicator, as they convey a message about where any individual's peers felt he belonged in the Melbourne bourgeoisie. Again information was limited, but the most significant indicator was membership of the prestigious Melbourne Club, which by all accounts was a near perfect reproduction of a smart London club. Within its exclusive portals mixed the leaders of Melbourne society, the men who constituted the most élite group. The position of the club was protected by a forty guinea yearly fee and a one-in-five blackball rule. Membership went to the pastoralists and those at the top of the professional tree. It was a place where integration between different groups could occur, but the desire to belong to the club and membership of it, suggests a closed and conservative group. There were certain people within the ruling élite who would be excluded on social grounds, including politicians who might wield governmental power, but could not, because of lowly birth and inadequate income, join the club. If a member of the committee of the Melbourne CC belonged to this club, then it is reasonable to assume that they had reached the inner sanctum of conservative Melbourne society. There were other clubs of some importance, including the Athenaeum and the Victoria. In the 1870s the Australian Club was founded with a high degree of participation from leading Melbourne CC men. These clubs were all exclusive, with high entrance fees and protective black-balling rules, but none held quite the same cachet or reputation that belonged to the Melbourne. Nevertheless, an overlap in membership of the Melbourne CC committee members and these institutions yields a sound indication of location within the élite ranks of the dominant class.

The clubs were almost direct reproductions of similar London institutions, enabling one English visitor to the Melbourne CC to say: 'it is almost as luxurious as Brook's, there are almost the same proportion of old fogies...no unionist peer could fail to recognise the ideal comfort of the Melbourne Club'.¹ The Melbourne CC, was part of this institutional reproduction, a process that can be described, as 'invention of

¹ Macintyre, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.4, p.61. The visitor in question was C.P.Trevelyan. Note the use of the word 'almost', a modifier that was frequently used by visiting upper-class Englishmen.

tradition'. Certainly, if we take Hobsbawm's definition of invented tradition, then the phenomena of the reproduction of English schools and clubs and the 'traditions' which were cultivated around them fulfils this criteria.¹ Obviously, the political and structural significance of this revolves around the fact that the traditions were invented by a class, in this case a colonial bourgeoisie.

Table 5.4: Percentage of each committee belonging to the Melbourne Club

Year	%
1860/1	21.4
1865/6	30.8
1870/1	18.2
1875/6	41.7
1880/1	45.5
1885/6	36.4
1890/1	36.4
1895/6	50.0
1900/1	21.4
1905/6	25.0
1910/11	25.0
1913/14	35.7
Mean (%)	32.3

Sources: Prof.A.G.L.Shaw; *Historical Memoirs of the Melbourne Club*; *Early Years of the Melbourne Club*;36 Collins Street.²

Table 5.4 examined the number of committee members who were also members of the Melbourne Club and thus by implication members of the highest social network in the colony. Throughout the period there was a core group of members who belonged to both the committee and the prestigious city club. The figures varied from year to year, but an examination of the over-all set of data shows that it was during the 1880s and 1890s that there was the highest correspondence, suggesting that it was in this period that the cricket club was at its most prestigious in social terms. Furthermore, the decline that followed the high figures of the 90s, suggests that there was a small slump in the social status of the committee. This is confirmed by two factors. Firstly, in terms of the management and administration of the game the 'golden years' of the club occurred at this time. Secondly, following the retirement and death of some of the most

1 Hobsbawm, T.Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983), p.9.

2 I am particularly grateful to Professor Shaw, Honorary Archivist at the Melbourne Club, who supplied me with data on Melbourne Club members. References cited are E.Scott, *Historical Memoirs of the Melbourne Club*, (Speciality Press Ltd., Melbourne 1936); McNicoll, R.*The Early Years of the Melbourne Club*, (Hawthorn Press, Melbourne 1976);R.McNicoll, *36 Collins Street Melbourne Club, 1838-1988*, (Allen and Unwin, Haynes, and the Melbourne Club, Sydney 1988).

prominent members of the committee, a new dynasty was 'founded' from about 1905, with the likes of E.F.Mitchell, E.J.Cordner and Doctors Mailer and MacLelland at the core of the committee clique. At this time neither Mailer nor MacLelland were members of the Melbourne Club.

Membership of the Melbourne Club was definitely one of the most important indicators of inclusion within Melburnian Society. There were, however, other clubs which were socially important, but not as prestigious as the Melbourne. It proved impossible to research cross-membership of the most important of these other clubs, the Athenaeum. However, something about the cross-membership of other clubs was discovered. The Victoria was one of the other prestigious social institutions in the city. It is known that the Melbourne CC frequently entertained visiting cricket sides there, including the amateurs of England teams. This suggests that there were links between the two institutions. Likewise, there were quite extensive connections between committee members of the cricket club and members of the Australian Club, which was founded in 1878. The Australian is an interesting example of an exclusive Melbourne institution. It was not quite as socially closed as the Melbourne Club, although it did boast some cross-membership with it. The entry fee was prohibitively high at £50, although the annual fee was not nearly as expensive, at a mere £12.¹ Ostensibly, the club was set up as an alternative to the Melbourne, as the former 'was at the east end of the city, and was by no means convenient for those whose business was located at the western end...it seemed to justify the establishment of a club more easily accessible than the Melbourne Club'.² The Australian was indeed 'more easily accessible' than the Melbourne Club, as it was easier to enter, although a member still had to be of the right degree of economic and social status. In the upper-echelons of the new club there was some cross-membership with the Melbourne Club, notably, Sir William Clarke, who was the Australian Club's first president. But there was also a high number of members of the cricket club who were members of the Australian but cannot be identified as members of the Melbourne Club. Bagot, A.W.Fraser, William McEvoy, Joseph Raleigh and John Younghusband, were all examples of this. Members of all three clubs included Clarke, J.G.Francis, William Wilson, James McLaughlin and C.D.Lloyd. Again, this indicates a wide degree of social integration on the Melbourne CC committee.

1 A. Akhurst, , *The History of the Australian Club - Melbourne*, (Australian Club, Melbourne 1978), p.10.

2 Akhurst, *The History of the Australian Club - Melbourne*, p.7.

Political

Few of the committee members were politicians. In the first few years there were some who served on the Legislative Council as nominated members or as elected representatives of the Legislative Assembly, to be sure, but by the end of the period the numbers dwindled to nothing at all. This is not to say that politicians were not involved in the club. Victorian Premiers W.C.Haines and Thomas Bent were both members of the club. This suggests that political duties were too onerous to enable a top-ranking politician to be involved in the executive of the club. This stands as a warning about attempting to interpret the absence of certain data. Many of those who served on the committee were of a background which would have enabled them to go into politics, almost all on the conservative side of politics. However, serving on the committee of the Melbourne CC was not compatible with a life in politics. Of course, committee members had political views and sometimes political ambitions. E.F.Mitchell attempted to gain election to the Assembly as a federationist. We also know that F.G.Smith was a die-hard conservative in a political as well as social sense. Judging by other criteria, it would be fair to assume that the committee members' were conservative, to varying degrees.¹

Denomination (Table 5.5)

Where denomination was known, it tended to be those members who belonged to the Church of England. This was particularly the case in ^{the} early part of this period. It is likely that the majority on any given committee would be Church of England. About 35% of Victorians were Anglicans, although within the dominant class this figure was probably much higher.² Despite the incomplete data set this particular feature is reflected in Table 5.5 with Anglicans in the majority. Nevertheless, in Melbourne society, religion was not the most important of status indicators. Within the dominant class of Melbourne it was acceptable to be a member of denominations other than the Anglican faith, especially with regard to the Presbyterian churches. From the mid-century, denominational private schools which catered for the expanding dominant class were established and, apart from St.Patrick's, the Roman Catholic school, all were relatively open to other denominations. This suggests that while there were sectarian differences, these tended to be partially submerged within the dominant class, although it is noticeable that the data on the Melbourne CC committee reveals that

1 In Australian politics this did not necessarily mean support for any one party as the party system was by no means developed in Victoria at this time. It did mean that they would be against radical measures and ministries like the radical Berry Government of the late 1870s.

2 Serle, *Rush to be Rich*, p.152. In 1881 35% of Victorians were Anglican. The figure was the same in 1891.

Catholics and Methodists were under-represented.¹ Undoubtedly there were religious tensions in Victoria and there was discrimination against Catholics and Jews. In the case of the former this could be overcome, as the career of Sir Leo Cussens suggests.² However, during this period the most impassioned religious dispute was not sectarian, but a schism within the Presbyterian church, which involved the excommunication of the moderate Dr. Charles Strong.³

Table 5.5: Denomination of committee members as a percentage

Year	C.of E.	Presby.	R.C.	Other	Unknown
1860/1	42.6				57.1
1865/6	58.3				41.7
1870/1	36.4			9.1	54.5
1875/6	50.0				50.0
1880/1	45.5	9.1			45.5
1885/6	63.6	18.2			18.2
1890/1	54.5	9.1			36.4
1895/6	45.5	18.2			36.4
1900/1	14.3	7.1			78.6
1905/6	33.3	8.3			58.3
1910/1	25.0	8.3	8.3		58.3
1913/4	35.7	14.3	7.1		42.9
Mean (%)	42.1	7.7	1.3	0.8	48.2

Source: Various incl *A.D.B.*; *Biographical Register*.

Key: C.of E.=Anglicans; Presby.=Presbyterians, incl.Church of Scotland and Church of Australia; R.C.=Roman Catholic; Other=Methodist, Irvingite.

V

The nature of the élite

These social indicators point in one direction. They suggest that on the committee there was a wide cross-section of people, ranging from some of the highest socialites in Victorian society, to some who were relatively unimportant. This indicates that within the cricket club there was a high degree of integration between élite groups, which may not have been as apparent in the social structure as a whole. This means, that the committee could act as an informal point of integration for fragments of the Melbourne

1 Serle, *Rush to be Rich*, p.152. In 1881 24% of Victorians belonged to the Roman Catholic Church. This figure had decreased to 22% 10 years later. With Methodists, the figures were 13% and 14% respectively.

2 If we are to accept that the Melbourne CC committee was firmly entrenched in the Melbourne élite this is the pattern that would appear. Rubinstein, 'Men of Wealth', in Goldberg, Smith, *Australian Cultural History*, p.110, comments that Australia's wealthy men were disproportionately Scots Presbyterians and English Anglicans. He also notes that Protestant dissenters were markedly absent from this group. This is not to say that we should equate wealth with class, as status too is important. Nevertheless this does provide broad confirmation that wealth and status position overlapped.

3 Serle, *Rush to be Rich*, pp.134-41.

upper class. Furthermore, because of the integration, this enabled certain committee members to acquire a symbol of status that could represent advancement within a class. In other words, membership of this body reflected an acknowledgement of a position within the class that was either ascribed by birth, or was achieved by advancement through the upper class with the aid of professional and occupational qualifications and the amassing of personal wealth and status.

Over the years the Melbourne CC committee established itself as an important facet in both Victorian cricket and society. It was this that made it a catchment area for both the socially established, who would have been interested in both the club and the game itself, and the socially aspirant, who were rising within the confines of a dominant class which was relatively open. It is natural that this should have occurred. The cricket club already had a reputation as a socially important institution. Because the committee was elected only those candidates who wanted to serve on such a body would stand. Equally, because a large membership elected those that stood they would only elect people they felt would best represent them and their beliefs. This process of election is very important because it gives an insight into how the committee could be used for socially generative purposes. The act of election was an act of selective choice. It represented an acceptance of a candidate from both the general constituency of the club and from the committee itself. It was an 'organic' process. Those who felt that they had attained a certain level of status/acceptability and respectability within Melbourne society would put themselves forward for election. If the electorate felt that they matched the criteria of social respectability combined with an interest in the club and cricket, they would be elected. At the same time the committee itself invited, suggested and encouraged certain members of the club to stand for election. This explains why normally there were very few candidates up for election, never more than twenty. It also reveals how the committee used its own socially incestuous network. Thus, E.Anderson was elected to the committee having married the daughter of club elder W.H.Handfield. It also explains the reason why, in the early years, there were many instances of business partners serving on the committee, e.g.Campbell and Creswick, Fraser and Cohen; and how, by the end of the period, there were many committee members who had been at the Church of England Grammar School. This was a society that was small, close knit, but recruited from a fairly broad social basis within the dominant class.

The social indicators have attempted to capture this social tone, both in the bare statistics that constitute the empirical backbone and the actual lives of the committee members. It is a tone that fully reflects the diverse nature of the upper class in Victorian society. It demonstrates the combination of pastoral, mercantile, commercial and

professional interests that transformed and were in turn transformed by the developing class structure in Melbourne. It was a society that was frequently misunderstood by visitors. For example, Anthony Trollope, did notice class differentiation, but with the upper class he concentrated on the pastoralists, who he saw as an emergent landed gentry.¹ It was the combination of these men and the merchants and professionals that constituted Melbourne's dominant class for much of this period. Trollope fundamentally mis-understood the hegemony that the city actually had over the countryside and the importance of the professional men within the infrastructure of the city. But like most observers, Trollope came to find what he wanted to find. He undertook a self-fulfilling exercise to confirm his long-held prejudices. Others, like Twopenny, had a slightly less exaggerated view, yet at the same time felt that there was a tendency towards social levelling. He pin-pointed the growth of a class of middle-class professionals, as well as a tendency towards the creation of a leisured class.² But then it would be easy to misinterpret him. He used the term class in the fluid sense of a modern functionalist, to indicate a stratification, rather than a cohesive social group. He certainly was not using 'class' in any Marxist/leftist sense. As such, he used the term 'society' in the same way as de Serville, to represent an exclusive group at the head of the social structure. 'Society' denominates the dominant class and their social life. Thus, he said of Melbourne:

If you are a man of leisure you will find more "society" in Melbourne, more balls and parties, a larger measure of intellectual life - i.e. more books and men of education and intellect, more and better theatrical and musical performances, more racing and cricket, football, and athletic clubs, a larger leisured class than in Sydney...the people dress better, talk better, think better, are better, if we accept Herbert Spencer's definition of progress.

The members of the Melbourne CC obviously accepted Spencer's definition of progress, as they certainly thought they were better than any other cricket club.

Twopenny, like Trollope, was a classic example of what is called in Australia, a 'stuck-up pom', and when using him as evidence, it is best to deconstruct his prejudices. His description of the colonists makes them seem like children, anxious to absorb anyone with a good introduction into 'society'.³ And yet he is more perspicacious than Trollope, probably because he spent many years in Australia. Thus, he notices the diverse and hierarchical nature of the Melbourne élite, when he states, 'in

1 See A.Trollope,*Victoria and Tasmania...Being a portion of the work entitled 'Australia and New Zealand'*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1874).

2 R.E.N.Twopenny,*Town Life in Australia*, (Elliot Stock, London 1883), pp.90-2.

3 Twopenny,*Town Life in Australia*, p.107.

Melbourne the scattered position of the suburbs and the extent of the population splits up the élite into several local societies, but there is one crème de la crème...'.¹ This was, of course, the Melbourne Club.

Compared to Trollope and especially Froude, who was unable to see beyond the closed society of Government House and the Melbourne Club,² Twopenny was a reliable witness. But all of them recognised the beliefs and loyalties of the élite groups who happened to be their hosts. They perceived their nostalgia for 'Home', their love of the Crown and, indeed, the Colony. This was the pattern of belief that was followed by members of the Melbourne CC and its committee. It was the framework of thought in which they operated. The following chapters will attempt to examine how these different strands were woven to create a divided cricket world which was wracked by bitter factional battles fought for supremacy. It will demonstrate how ideas about class and cricket were translated into a desire to control cricket, a desire which clashed with other groups within the ruling class who wanted the prize of rule over one of Australia's most universal and popular sports. It will show how divided loyalties to club, colony, country and empire nearly engulfed and destroyed cricket.

1 Twopenny, *Town Life in Australia*, p.109.

2 Serle, *The Rush to be Rich*, pp.216-18.

I

Philathletes at the Melbourne CC

The committee of the Melbourne CC was a haven for philathleticism in the best traditions of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. That this was so is patently obvious in the actions of the committee towards professionals and amateurs. It also explains the vast input that committee and club had in framing the rules of Australian football with two prominent club members, Wills and Harrison, being particularly responsible. Of all codes of football this was the one that most closely resembled the football of Thomas Hughes's Rugby school, and it is not coincidental that Wills, one of the founders of the sport, was an Old Rugbeian himself.¹

Within dominant class Melbourne society the creed of athleticism was of great importance. As has been seen, the pages of *Bell's Life in Victoria* were one long paean to the beauties of Anglo-Saxon sport and if the practice was not quite as sporting as the code suggested, this could be buried in editorials which were more than effusive about the glories of cricket and other athletic sports. There were men on the committee who were directly identifiable with this phenomenon, including Professor Martin Irving (vice-president 1870-71), who was first professor of classics at Melbourne University and headmaster at Wesley College. Irving was, among other things, founder and president of the University boat club and as a teacher did much to encourage philathleticism within the Melbourne upper-class. He married the daughter of L.L.Mount, one of the great athletes of early Melbourne, and was noted by the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* as placing 'an Arnoldian stress on character formation and trust in the sixth form as "a democracy of gentlemen"' at Wesley College'. It is no surprise that his successor, L.A.Adamson, fostered and put into practice similar beliefs.²

1 There is no definitive history of Australian Rules as yet although, I.Turner, L.Sanderson, *Up Where Cazaly?*, (Granada, London 1981), is a good general survey of the subject. They note the importance of Wills, Harrison and Hammersely to the drawing up of the first set of rules in 1858. While Wills had been to Rugby, Hammersely had been at Cambridge in the 1840s when the Cambridge rules were drawn up. Unfortunately neither set of rules is extant, so the similarities between the two, while likely, are not known. (pp.22-3).

2 For Irving see *A.D.B.*, Vol.4, pp.463-4. Adamson is regarded as one of the great headmasters in Australian history. For a comprehensive biography see *A.D.B.*, Vol. 7, pp.11-13. Adamson had been to Rugby and Oriel Cambridge. Although a qualified Barrister, he became a school and university teacher in Melbourne. In 1902 he got the headmastership of Wesley College. There he placed great emphasis on sport as a method of character training. Although a believer in 'fair play', the competitiveness of school sport in the Melbourne public schools resulted in several well publicised controversies between Wesley and other schools and Wesley teams were sometimes accused of poor

Of all philathletes on the committee the greatest was, undoubtedly, H.C.A.Harrison, along with L.L.Mount one of the colony's most famous early pedestrians. Harrison came from an extremely interesting background, as his ancestors consisted of convict emancipists Thomas Reiby and George Howe, as well as great pioneer pastoral families like the Antills who were pillars of the New South Wales squattocracy.¹ His father, however, was ex-army captain John Harrison, who happened to be a firebrand republican radical. Despite this, Harrison was sent to the Diocesan Grammar School in Melbourne, the early name of the Church of England Grammar School. On leaving school Harrison joined Victoria's civil service, which demonstrates that he must have had some influential friends in high places as entry to that body was through patronage rather than ability.² He thrived in the service until he retired in the 1890s whereupon he started to style himself 'gentleman'. During this period, he made several important contributions to the sporting life of Melbourne; the first and most important of which was the previously mentioned role he played in the foundation of Australian Rules football. He also played a fundamental part in the early organisation of athletics, as well as becoming one of the pillars of the cricket club.

Paradoxically, it was his role in the organisation of athletics which demonstrates the importance of Harrison to philathleticism.³ At the same time it also demonstrates how involved the cricket club was with other sports and how it was prepared to promote and develop them as part of an ideological commitment to the games ethic. Harrison was one of the co-founders of the Melbourne Amateur Athletic Sports with other Melbourne CC members J.B.Thompson, R.W.Wardill, W.J.Hammersley, and

sportsmanship. In 1969, Sir James Darling attributed to Adamson's influence the over-emphasis on competitive sport in Victorian public schools in the 1930s.

1 A.Atkinson, *Camden. Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1988), pp.22-3; 32; 42-3. The Antills were pillars of the Camden district. Major Henry Colden Antill was a police magistrate and a paternalist who thoroughly believed in the mechanics and majesty of justice. He was well acquainted with James and William MacArthur, two of the notable and infamous MacArthur family.

2 Serle, *The Rush to be Rich*, pp.33-5. Serle talks about attempts to reform the Civil Service. An act in 1862 had been passed to base selection for the Service on examination and meritocracy. However, loopholes remained which allowed the practice of ministerial patronage to remain. Prior to 1880 it had been extremely difficult to enter the Service without a political patron. By that date it was nearly impossible. Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.111, state that in Victoria between 1862 and 1882 only a tenth of the persons entering the Public Service took the examination. The rest, totalling almost 16,000, owed their appointment to patronage.

3 Details of Harrison's life were taken from A.Mancini, G.M.Hibbins (eds.), *Running with the Ball. Football's Foster Father*, Lynedoch Pubs., Melbourne 1987), pp. 2-26. This book is mainly a re-print of Harrison's autobiography which was published in 1926 and called *The Story of an Athlete*, and details Harrison's part in the foundation of Australian Rules Football, and his own career as both an amateur pedestrian and cricketer.

M.E.O'Brien.¹ This body was founded under the aegis of the Melbourne CC, and many athletic meetings were held on the cricket ground. Its philosophy was wholeheartedly amateur, pure and Muscular Christian. It adopted the motto of *Mens sana in corpore sano* and printed a manifesto in its first programme which seemed to have been copied off the pages of a work by Herbert Spencer and into the records of the cricket club. It is worth quoting in detail, as it shows the ideology of one of Melbourne CC committee's greatest members of the era and it is likely such sentiments were common currency on the committee over the period:

The most eminent men have ever entertained the opinion that longevity depends upon the exercise of the body, as do also good temper, cheerfulness of disposition, and lively spirits.

Nature has given the body a great influence over the soul. The practices which draw out all the resources of bodily beauty tend likewise to the maintenance of health and purity of mind. "Physical decline and moral depravity are intimately connected", and "those laws are requisite for the preservation of health serve also to preserve and improve the morals".

That well-regulated physical exercise is conducive to health and longevity, is a fact too patent to need even a passing remark, but its value in aiding the operations of the brain, by increasing and regulating the nervous force, although equally true, has not received such general acknowledgement.

The ancient history of Greece teaches us the people of that noble country were physically, the most perfect of the human race. Their universal attention to physical education was highly influential, not alone in producing a Venus or Apollo, but a Homer and a Pindar.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills and prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."²

Many of those who served on the sports committee were members of the Melbourne CC committee as well, at some time or other. These included Professor Irving. The passage reflects the ideal which all of them held to be true and demonstrates the club's attitude to sport and its role in society. And yet, for all its classicisms and the inherent class-consciousness of such statements, many of those who served on this body were unable to gain entrance to the Melbourne Club, among them Harrison. Yet they were undoubtedly part of the Melbourne dominant class.

1 Of these, only Thompson did not serve on the committee of the cricket club.

2 From a minute book entitled *Melbourne Amateur Athletic Sports*, which is part of the Melbourne CC collection. This quotation is the printed frontispiece to the 1864 programme of sports. The couplet at the end is from Goldsmith's poem *The Deserted Village*. There were no page numbers. I am grateful to Rex Harcourt for pointing this out to me. See H.Spencer, *Education. Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*, (Williams and Norgate, London 1906), p.229: 'Perhaps nothing will so much hasten the time when body and mind will both be adequately cared for, as a diffusion of the belief that the preservation of health is a *duty*. Few seem conscious that there is such a thing as physical morality'.

Given that philathleticism was part of a larger ideology which encompassed such things as Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism, bourgeois respectability and class conciliation within a differentiated structure, one would expect that the actions of Harrison *et.al.* would reflect this. The rest of this chapter will examine some of the words and deeds that were produced by this ideology and so further establish that the Melbourne CC committee was an important social institution within Victorian society and helped weave the fabric of its dominant class.

II

Keeping the club respectable: the committee and the membership ceilings

From 1860 to 1914 the membership of the club expanded from 111 to over 5000, a rise that was even more dramatic than the expansion over the same period of time at the Marylebone CC. This rise was due to the growth of Melbourne from town to metropolis; the increasing popularity of cricket and the concomitant privileges accorded to members for access to big cricket matches; and the unique social prestige of the Melbourne CC in the world of Victorian cricket. As the membership grew so too did the facilities,¹ but it is noticeable that the rise occurred in fits and starts, with early peaks in the All-England touring years of 1861-62, and 1863-64. The figures are not complete, but they do indicate that it was not until 1881 that the rise became fast and steady. This was a direct result of the success of the Australian XI.²

The club was always faced with a simple but problematic equation: how could they balance the need for finance, which could be generated from increased entrance fees and subscriptions, with the need to keep the club exclusive?³ At the same time they were faced with a situation where the more members that were elected the more facilities were needed to accommodate the increase, and therefore the more money was needed to finance these new developments. Of course, the best way to raise more recurrent income was to increase the number of members. There was a definite potential

1 For example, the building of new stands and pavilions. A new pavilion was built for members in 1881, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 30 Apr. 1881, but when that proved too small for the rapidly expanding membership, yet another pavilion was planned and built in the early twentieth century. It is this structure that still stands today, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 Sept. 1905.

2 Including Junior and Country members, the figures for the year following Lillywhite's tour in 1876-77 fell from 587 to about 400. Membership rose again in 1878-79 to 534 and continued upwards to 572 in the following year. The 1880-81 season saw a massive leap to 908, suggesting that the success of the Australian XI in Britain had fired the imagination of the Melbourne bourgeoisie as it had fired those of the rest of Australia. From there on the climb was rapid, only being halted by the imposition of membership ceilings. Source for all figures, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, annual reports to the A.G.M.

3 As part of the club's 'selling point', the need to keep it exclusive was of paramount importance. If established members had felt that the club was becoming too socially open they would have left in droves.

for the club to become locked in a spiral of social devaluation. Therefore, after 1880, the committee decided that there was a need to impose a ceiling on full membership numbers,¹ which was set at the figure of 1500.² The lists continued to fill with rapidity and by 1883 it was felt necessary to raise the limit to 2000 members, which was duly done with little opposition at the Annual General Meeting of the club.³ A further rise in the ceiling occurred with little opposition during the 1890s lifting the limit to 2500, but when, in 1901, there was a proposal to raise this figure by 1000 there were vociferous objections. The problem was that increased membership had put such a pressure on the facilities of the club that the committee felt it was necessary to increase the capacity of the membership areas of the ground. They therefore needed to raise finance to achieve this. The suggestion was initially made in June 1901, and when it was brought before the committee, William Bruce resigned as a mark of protest.⁴ Bruce had been a long-standing member of the committee and very popular with the membership. His replacement, Norman Bayles, also tendered his resignation for exactly the same reason.⁵ Within the body of the club there was also a strong feeling against the rise in numbers. The committee had to call a meeting to ratify the proposed change and when this was convened at the beginning of August it had to be adjourned immediately as the venue could not accommodate the 455 members who turned up.⁶ When the meeting recommenced a week later only 180 out of 672 present voted for the increase.⁷

The committee left it a few more years before attempting to execute the rise, but in 1905 they proposed a rule that would boost the ceiling to 3500. They knew that if this rule was put through there were 850 people waiting for election and the increase in entrance fees alone for that year would have been approximately 3000 guineas. At a General Meeting this argument proved persuasive.⁸ The committee insisted that this move would help raise the capital for new buildings and there was only one dissident. By 1907, however, the financial position of the club had deteriorated and there was a desperate need for further capital to be raised. In September a meeting was held where a motion to raise the ceiling to 4000 was rejected, but authorised the committee to take a ballot of the club 'if advisable'.⁹ It was not felt advisable to do so until December,

1 As opposed to junior and country.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 18 Aug. 1881. the decision was ratified at a Special General Meeting of the club on the same date.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 Sept. 1883.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 24 June 1901.

5 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 July 1901.

6 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 2 Aug. 1901.

7 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 7 Aug. 1901.

8 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 Sept. 1905.

9 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 11 Sept. 1907.

when another meeting was held to tackle the issue. By this time the club's overdraft had soared to around £8000 and additional members were required to cover this debt. The motion was actually passed, but the majority was too small to make the rule effective.¹ Nevertheless the problem of finance was too urgent not to raise its ugly and vulgar head again.

There were people on the committee who were continually searching for a solution. One of these was H.C.A.Harrison. His suggestion was that the ground capacity be expanded. At a Special General Meeting in 1908, he argued that 'it was the public coming and paying 1/- for admission who had made the club'. This was an unpalatable statement to some of the more high-and-mighty members who barracked Harrison with 'expressions of dissent' including 'rot'.² 'Rot', however, was not an answer to the problem and although the motion was lost it was just over a month before another meeting was held to discuss tackling the overdraft which had now reached the monumental figure of £8668 11/- 11d. The measures put forward by the committee were that the club should borrow £15000 in debentures to build expanded accommodation as well as increasing the number of members to 4000. This time there were few cries of dissent and the issue was brought forward to the Annual Meeting of the club in September where it was passed. Only 13 out of 342 voted against the increased ceiling. The finances of the club had become so dire that it was pointless to resist; the issue now being the survival of the institution and its maintenance as the 'premier' club in Victoria.³

III

Discipline and punish (I): club members' and 'respectable' behaviour

The point at issue over membership ceilings was quite simple. From the 1890s the members of the club became sensitive to the fact that if too many were allowed to join the respectability of the club would become compromised. Broadening the social base and hence 'social debasement' was an inevitable consequence of rapid expansion, despite the filter mechanism of proposer, seconder and the blackball. Thus some 'scoundrels' were admitted to the club, but in these instances the committee acted to discipline or expel them. The committee was fully aware of its duty to uphold the propriety of the club and act with due wrath when certain social conventions were

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 18 Dec. 1907. The vote was 108 to 60. To make a rule effective the majority had to be 75%.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 June 1908. This was a report of the proceedings of the meeting that was in *The Age*, (5 June, 1908), but was pasted into the minute book under the date of the meeting.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 10 Sept. 1908.

breached. If scandal got out of hand the club was damaged.¹ Thus there were several occasions when the committee acted as the moral policeman of the membership, two of which will be dealt with here. One case involved drunkenness and violence, while the other was altogether more extraordinary, involving a woman of 'ill repute', a liar and a detective. Both prove that from an early date the spirit of Melburnian wowserism was alive and kicking in the club.

In April 1868 the committee asked two of the club's best players to resign due to 'disgraceful misconduct' when returning from a match at Ballarat. In fact, they were given a simple choice; resign or suffer the ignominious fate of trial by a Special General Meeting.² On the 5 May J.Hardcastle appeared before the committee asking for the charges that had been made against him. These were:

1. Gross language in the presence and hearing of female passengers.
2. Striking Mr. Fitzgerald (a mere lad) in the face, without provocation.
3. General riotous conduct to the annoyance of the passengers, and the discredit of the club.³

Hardcastle admitted 'he was under the influence of liquor', although he denied the second charge by stating that he had received provocation. Fitzgerald was brought into the proceedings to deny this and his denial was corroborated by T.J.D.Kelly. Apparently, Hardcastle was unable to offer a defence to the other charges and promptly resigned. It is certain that John Conway had behaved similarly to Hardcastle and because he resigned with a minimum of fuss there was no charge-sheet and no trial in front of the committee.⁴ As far as the committee was concerned it had no choice in its actions over this 'scandal'. It could not afford to bring its name into disrepute and therefore it dispensed with two of the club's most distinguished amateur cricketers. In

1 In 1864 there was a massive scandal over blackballing. It was suggested that there was a 'clique' operating in the club whose aim it was to blackball people vindictively on the sole grounds of dislike rather than social acceptability. These accusations led to a Special General Meeting which discussed the matter. During the course of this meeting several other accusations were levelled against the club about its general respectability. The Reverend T.H.Fellowes claimed that a member had sworn at him and that he had heard language of a 'disgraceful' nature in the pavilion. This was confirmed by club elder D.S.Campbell who claimed that he had heard language worse than that of 'the commonest bullock driver who had ever been lagged to Van Diemen's Land'. The dispute was undoubtedly detrimental to the club as it was reported with glee to the people of Melbourne by David Syme's radical paper *The Age*. See esp., *Age*, (14 Jan. 1864), p.5.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 21 April 1868.

3 Notice the use of 'mere lad', the fact being that the striking of one so young compounded the nature of the crime greatly.

4 The details of this incident were taken from the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 21 April; 5 May; 9 June. Conway took his revenge by chastising the club at every available opportunity through his professional duties as a journalist. Later on he became the manager of the first Australian XI.

fact, Conway, who had been educated at Scotch College, had had his subscription paid for him by the club.¹ He was a fine cricketer but after the Ballarat incident there could be no question about him remaining a member.

The second incident involved a Mr. Dickens and it proves that by the 1880s the seeds of wowserism had already been sown, even during the heady days of 'marvellous Melbourne'. In January 1884 the Minutes recorded that 'Mr. A.G. Dickens had introduced an improper person into the Ladies Reserve on the 1st inst.'. They therefore felt 'reluctantly compelled to ask that gentleman if he is prepared to deny the fact'.² Dickens's reply was recorded 'intimating his willingness to give the name & address of the lady, and also of her parents if required'.³ He obviously felt that this display of compliance would forestall enquiries as a 'gentleman's' word was usually not questioned. But at the same meeting the secretary was instructed to ask him for these details. Dickens duly obliged. The committee was still not satisfied and the secretary was told to see the detective on duty at Sandridge 'and make enquiries personally as to character of Lady [sic] whose name was before the committee'.⁴ They at least seemed convinced that the accused was guilty of immoral actions and the imputations of this were regarded as so severe that the matter had to be pursued to a final outcome. Thus, in March J.C. Stewart⁵ reported a conversation that he had had with Dickens and that a meeting with a sub-committee had been arranged to resolve the matter.⁶ Finally, almost a month later, Dickens wrote an apology which was apparently so contrite that the committee decided to take no further action in the matter.⁷

The whole question of respectability was crucial to a club which regarded itself as the guardian of the English moral code of cricket. The members of the committee were in no doubt that if they were to be seen as the premier institution of their kind then everything must be pure and wholesome. They could not afford to gain the adverse publicity that the 1864 affair had given them, especially at a time when their position was being challenged by other cricket clubs like the East Melbourne, and also by the

1 Earlier that season the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 Sept. 1868, recorded that 'his subscription for the past season be remitted, and that he be presented with a ticket of membership for this season as a token of the club's appreciation of his qualities as a cricketer'.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 9 Jan. 1884.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 23 Jan. 1884.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 6 Feb. 1884.

5 Lawyer, and soon to be Mayor of the city, 1885-86. He was on the committee at this time, and remained a respected elder of the club for some time. Stewart was born in Scotland, and was a senior partner in Malleeson, Stewart, Stawell, and Nankivell, a leading law firm in the city, from H.J. Gibney, A.G. Smith, *A Biographical Register, 1788-1939*, (A.D.B., Australian National University, Canberra 1987), p.281.

6 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 5 Mar. 1884.

7 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 2 Apr. 1884.

Victorian Cricketers' Association (VCA). If the committee was to exercise moral control over the crowds that flocked to its ground and the players that played for the club, then it was necessary for them to keep their own house in order and to set a worthy example befitting their position as the premier cricket institution in the colony, and perhaps the whole of Australia.

IV

The committee and crowd control; barracking and gambling

The Melbourne CC committee was not just concerned with the good moral behaviour of its members. It was equally concerned with the behaviour of the crowds that patronised the cricket ground. Thus they stood resolutely against two of the perceived 'evils' of Australian cricket: barracking and gambling. Of the two, barracking was generally regarded as something that was intrinsically Australian. It supposedly emanated from the outer section of the crowd and was therefore identified as a phenomenon produced by the Australian working class and low-paid white collar workers. Many touring English cricketers commented unfavourably upon this supposedly unique feature of Australian crowd behaviour. Notable inclusions on this list of critics were A.E. Stoddart and Ranjitsinhji in 1897. Stoddart went as far as to call it 'evil', while the Indian prince was disturbed and hurt by his treatment by the crowd.¹ They were not the first to suffer at the hands of what was a plebeian tradition. However, it was they who made the most noise about it. From this time onwards criticism of Australian barracking became part and parcel of English comments on touring, especially in 1911-12. This continued after the war and was one of the most

¹ Cashman, 'Ave a Go...', pp.48-50. In the case of Ranji there were definitely racist slurs made against him. *The Bulletin* in particular contributed to this. Ranji had laid himself open to criticism by complaining about Australian crowds and their barracking. Nevertheless *The Bulletin* waged a campaign against him before he had even made his feelings known. For example, (18 Dec. 1897), p.24, a letter was published which effectively claimed that Ranji was not exceptional, his ability being biologically innate: 'Catch a blackfellow young, give him an English (cricket) master, send him to a university to study more cricket, and if he is an ordinary nigger, I don't see why he shouldn't beat Ranji at his own game'. They continually desecrated his claims to being a prince. Thus, (1 Jan. 1898), p.24, they said 'Ranji now is only a brown pretender in very modest circumstances, and he doesn't even pretend to the throne in a very active way. Also, it is hardly large enough to be called a throne'. Two weeks later, (15 Jan. 1898), p.24, they went even further, claiming that Nawanagar was about as important as the Melbourne suburb of Collingwood! Furthermore, 'The exceeding Hinglishness [sic.] of Ranji's walk and general style makes one smile. The dark gentleman has such an awfully jolly johnbull air of don't-care-a-dam about the bowling, bai jove! [sic.] He is as English as Sydney's Chinese Anglican clergyman, Soo Hoo Ten - who, viewed afloat, is the most English-looking and gentlemanly member of the N.S.W. Anglican "Cloth"'.

colourful contributions to the rancorous Bodyline affair in the 1930s.¹ Of course, such behaviour did occur in Britain, although the barracking may have been slightly less effusive,² and the fact remains that barracking was identified with Australian cricket and specifically, within this context, the working class 'shilling spectator'.

While traditionally the home of barracking is believed to be The Hill at the Sydney Cricket Ground, there was still similar behaviour at Melbourne. George Giffen,³ for example, identified the cruelty of the Melbourne barracker. When William Bruce dropped a catch in an intercolonial game between Victoria and South Australia sections of the crowd became loud and unruly, dishing out pieces of advice for the unfortunate culprit. In mentioning this incident Giffen commented that he wanted to demonstrate 'how cruel the Melbourne barrackers can be'. Furthermore, he added that here 'was a man who had given them some of their pleasantest hours on the...ground, for once, on account of illness failing', and that despite this they 'reviled him and heaped ridicule on him'.⁴

As this tradition emanated from the 'outer' it is not difficult to guess on whose side the members and committee were. They were resolutely and steadfastly against barracking. Presumably their will was backed up by stewards, but on the whole one gets the impression that they relied on the unlikely possibility of conversion through moral persuasion. The problem was undoubtedly extensive by the 1890s. In 1892 the *Australasian* commented:

A most discreditable proceeding on the part of the crowd was the disgraceful "barracking"...It is high time that the MCC authorities took steps to put a stop to this sort of thing...Perhaps a few posters

1 For a full description of the barracking issues during the controversial tour see B.Stoddart, R.Sissons, *Cricket and Empire. The 1932-33 Bodyline Tour of Australia*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1984), esp. p.39.

2 A.Guttmann, *Sports Spectators*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1986), pp.101-4, compares both English and Australian Cricket crowds, noting that the latter were rowdier and from a more plebeian background. W.Vamplew, 'Sports Crowds Disorder in Britain', p.7, notes that cricket crowds in England were capable of mounting their own barracking assaults. For example, there was community whistling of the Dead March by the Surrey crowd when Australia's opening pair was making slow progress at the Oval in 1899. Likewise, it was generally reckoned that Northern crowds were more vocal than their southern counterparts, perhaps as a result of being predominantly working class. Sandiford, 'English Cricket Crowds', p.17. Notably, on the visit of the 1st Australian XI, they received a lot of hostility from Yorkshire crowds. In the vocabulary of the day, they met with 'rough language'. See 'Argus' (P.E.Reynolds), *The Australian Cricketers' Tour through Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain*, p.52: 'Every member of the Eleven had been very disagreeably nick-named long before the day was over'. Nevertheless, Stoddart and Sissons, *Cricket and Empire*, p.39, maintain that barracking 'was quite unlike the demure demeanour of English crowds'.

3 One of the greatest Australian cricketers of this period, Giffen, was a postman from South Australia.

4 G.Giffen, *With Bat and Ball. Twenty-Five Years Reminiscences of Australian and Anglo-Australian Cricket*, (Ward, Lock and co., London 1898), p.171.

round the ground requesting the lookers-on to show ordinary courtesy to visitors might be attended with beneficial results.¹

But little was done by the committee except to make condemnations about the abuse and expressions of hope that it would disappear. Thus the club president of that time, F.G.Smith, said:

He had referred on a former occasion to the objectionable practice of barracking the players, and it had pleased him during the past season to find an entire absence of this kind of thing. There had been no addressing the players by name, and the matches had been conducted in a creditable and hearty and sportsmanlike manner.²

Smith was in fact deluding himself; barracking did not disappear. In 1911 E.F.Mitchell wrote a letter to the committee on the subject. Having received the letter 'it was resolved that the secretary be directed to instruct constables to remove persons acting in an offensive manner during the forthcoming cricket matches'.³ This root and branch action failed outright. To this day an area of the ground situated in the now reconstructed South Stand, named ominously 'Bay Thirteen', remains a haven for the barracker and is the home of a long and unbroken tradition which stretches back to this period.⁴

Gambling was another area where the maintenance of respectability was of paramount importance. The amateur traditions of cricket demanded it. Betting meant the possibility of fixed matches and the damnation of the participants to an eternity in hell - or so the evangelicals had it. We have seen how in England Lord's was purged of gambling before this particular period and how men of the ilk of Lord Harris resolutely resisted its evils. Nevertheless the majority of people in Australia resisted the pleas for moral reform which emanated from the bourgeois interventionists. Gambling was the cause of many disputes in Australian cricket and Harris himself blamed it for the incident that occurred in Sydney when his team toured in 1879. Following the dismissal of one of the Australian batsmen the pitch was invaded and a riot, of sorts, ensued. Harris bluntly stated in a letter home that he blamed 'the members of the association...for their discourtesy and uncricketlike behaviour to their guests'. Furthermore he blamed 'the committee officers of the association for ever permitting betting'.⁵ Harris had already absolved the Association of any blame to their faces, so when his letter was published in the British press they were none too pleased. Their

1 *Australasian*, (1 Jan. 1892), p.17.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 9 Sept. 1893.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 19 Dec. 1911.

4 As is the way with all traditions, it is said that the barracking is of a much lower standard these days. The golden age of barracking belongs to the past in the same way as the golden age of *Punch*.

5 *Wisden Cricketers' Almanack*, (1880, reprint facsimile McKenzie's, Epsom 1987), p.34.

reply stated that among other things betting was prohibited at cricket matches, a rule that existed in Victoria as well.

All cricketing authorities were sensitive to the evils of gambling, especially following the Harris incident, and none more so than the Melbourne CC. The committee was continually in a difficult position, because the ground was used for athletic meetings and, at a later date, cycling races, both of which were targets for the hardened bookmaker and punter. Cricket was rarely a problem in this respect, but as main controller of the ground, the committee were responsible for controlling the behaviour of the crowds, and presumably the competitors too, at all events staged on the ground. It was their duty to see that the respectability of society was not breached by abuses related to gambling. Thus in 1888 they attempted to suppress betting at sporting events,¹ a measure that obviously failed because in 1901 the committee advised their president, R. Murchison, to sign a petition in support of a Bill which was drafted to suppress gambling at sports meetings.² It was the tarnished reputation of athletics as an arena for gambling-inspired cheating which caused many of the members to vote against the construction of a permanent running track ('rink') around the ground in 1869. As one member put it 'the formation of the rink...would deteriorate from the respectability of the club',³ and the decision was taken not to construct this amenity.

Concerns over gambling sprang from the same ideological roots as fears about professionalism and were based upon the tenets of class. A gentleman was allowed to bet because he had money that he could afford to lose and because he would not be debased or corrupted by the act of gambling. A member of the working-class, however, was like a susceptible child who should not be allowed to fritter away what little income he possessed. Gambling corrupted, as did professionalism. Hence the paranoia about it and the necessity to proscribe it. Nevertheless, it was an attitude that stretched beyond the confines of crowd control and into the disciplining and punishment of professionals at the club.

1 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 25 Apr. 1888.

2 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 29 Nov. 1901. They were particularly worried about gambling at the 'Austral' cycle race which was, by that time, one of the premier events of its kind in Australia. Indeed, they had due cause to be worried as the Austral had become a target for a betting scam which led to investigation of the race by the ruling body, the League of Victorian Wheelmen. In one famous incident the race was fixed, allegedly by Collingwood bookmaker John Wren. This, and the whole issue of betting is dealt with in F. Hardy's masterpiece on the career of John Wren, *Power Without Glory*, (Angus and Robertson, Melbourne 1982).

3 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 1 Nov. 1869.

Discipline and punish (II): actions and attitudes to club professionals and employees ¹

The Melbourne CC kept a small staff of professionals whose duty it was to bowl to members, to play in cricket matches when required and to work upon the ground. The numbers of professionals employed each year varied, but was generally between 5 and 13. The presence of professionals at the club was a constant feature throughout the period and became more important towards the end. Every year, following the Annual General Meeting in September, advertisements were placed in the papers asking for professionals to apply to the club as bowlers. Every year a stream of hopefuls turned up for their 'audition' and many of them were employed over time. Usually, these men were given a contract for a 24 week period for which their pay varied. At the end of this time they would usually be dismissed unless they were permanent employees of the club, like the pavilion keeper, or, occasionally, the groundsman.

These professionals and employees were treated as members of a lower class, the relationship of the club to them being that of patriarchal employer to deferent employee. Thus they behaved to their paid cricketers and ground-staff as fathers to errant children, employing the 'rod' when necessary for crimes against the respectability of society (usually, of course, drunkenness), or acting the good Samaritan to worthies that might have fallen on hard times. In terms of class structure this is extremely revealing, even more so when compared to the kowtowing attitude the club adopted when bringing over amateurs from England. This section will concentrate on the club's own employees, but it will also examine the ideology which was revealed when teams from England arrived in Victoria and how, in these cases, they invariably replicated the behaviour of English cricketing authorities towards the professionals and amateurs that came with these teams.

The number of professionals employed varied according to how much the club was prepared to expend upon them, but it is noticeable that as time went by more men were employed, thus mirroring the expansion of the club. Consequently, after 1880, as the membership exploded on an upward spiral so too did the number of staff and the amount spent on them. Thus in the period between 1860 and 1883 the club employed at most a meagre 5 (in 1879-80), of which some were part-time. Between 1883 and 1900 this figure increased considerably, the lowest figure being 5 (1888-89) and the highest 13 (1898-99).² To get a fuller picture of the employment of ground bowlers/professionals several different factors were examined. As well as looking at

¹ All data on employment conditions of professionals collected from *Minutes of Melbourne CC*.

² Figures after 1900 were not examined because the records became slightly vague, although, as will be seen below, there was a definite continuity of practices which had been apparent for the entire period.

the numbers who served the club, prospective expenditure for the year on professionals, the average wage paid to them and the range of wages themselves were calculated. These figures are not wholly accurate and like those on the committee are intended to be merely indicative. Indeed, the club usually spent more upon professionals than they proposed. This occurred for a number of reasons, including the payment of bonuses and talent money, both of which became features of the club in the 1870s.¹ Figures for expenditure on professionals might vary over the season, due to other factors such as dismissals, discipline, or even the decision to employ more men on higher wages. However, the Minutes are not always accurate about this and only at the beginning of a season is it possible to ascertain who the club intended employing and for how much.²

Generally two types of professional were employed. The first would be taken on as a full time bowler whose duty it was to be present at the ground between 3 pm and 7pm five days a week, for the purpose of bowling to members. They would also be required to play in matches. They were, therefore, full-time employees whose main income over 6 months of the year was gained through cricket. Sometimes, they were actually employed explicitly as coaches, a position that was undoubtedly more prestigious than that of mere 'professional bowler'. This most commonly occurred in the 1860s, significantly when William Caffyn of the All-England XI was signed up as coach on a £300 per annum contract in 1864,³ and following that when Samuel Cosstick was employed for £150 p.a. in the years 1865-67.⁴ This was a rare occurrence, partially because both Cosstick and Caffyn were employed on a year round basis. The club did however use other coaches, including T.W.Wills (1867-71),⁵ and Jim Phillips, who was originally employed in 1883, but who was officially made coach

1 First references to talent money were found in the 1875-76 season, from *Minutes of Melbourne CC*.

2 The figures for proposed expenditure and average wages over the season were calculated on the basis that the length of employment was 24 weeks, which seems to have been the norm, although some may have been employed for less time than that. Because of the inexactitude of the source from which this data was gathered it is difficult to take such factors into account.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 23 Apr. 1864.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 Sept. 1866.

5 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 Sept. 1867. Interestingly, Cosstick and Wills served together for the period 1867-71. While they were both paid the same sums of money Wills was treated completely differently. Wills, of course came from a different class background to Cosstick, and although he had obviously fallen on hard times, his caste was never entirely forgotten. Thus when he was appointed the minutes recorded: ' - Cosstick professional bowler for the season £3.10/ per week. That Mr. Wills be requested to act as tutor to the club at a salary of £3 per week for the season'. Thus Cosstick was merely appointed, while 'Mr.' (the term for an amateur in the cricket world) was to be 'requested' to take up an appointment. This was a simple clash between the blunt language of oppression and the euphemistic language of class-solidarity.

in 1889,¹ and proceeded to commute between Britain, where he was a first-class cricket umpire, and Australia, with the club footing the bill for his return passage. Even when employed for the season these 'top' professionals would receive an income of around £3 a week, or £72 for the entire period, which was about the average wages for a skilled manual worker or a clerk at the turn of the century.² Of course, the seasonal nature of the work would have undoubtedly caused problems of employment during the off-season. Some, like Cosstick, solved this by playing football, and presumably doing some other part-time job of an unskilled, or even skilled, nature. Others of the early professionals, including George Marshall and Gideon Elliot, owned hotels and supplied cricket materials.³ Phillips, was involved in cricket year round, playing in Melbourne, umpiring in England and probably supplemented his income by importing cricket materials into Australia from Britain as well.

The wages of the 'top' professionals did vary over time, presumably the result of retrenchments and expansions within the club according to the number of members, the demand for the services of the professionals from those members and the club's balance at the bank.⁴ For example, in the early 1870s, when membership was low, the

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 7 Nov. 1889.

2 This figure compared reasonably favourably with English professionals. Vamplew, *Pay Up and Play the Game*, pp.218-221. At Lancashire CCC, where the top wage was £3 in 1889, 4 out of 8 professionals received a similar wage (in 1883 none of 3 professionals had earned that much). This figure increased to 12 out of 18 in 1895, and 17 out of 24 in 1901. At Leicestershire CCC in 1896 none of their 7 pros were paid this much, the highest wage being £2.5/-. By 1902 1 was paid £4 and 3 were paid £3, while the remaining 6 were paid less. Of course, wage structures were slightly different when a county match occurred. Then professionals who played in the game would not receive a wage, but instead would earn a match fee of between £4 and £6. This did not occur in Melbourne, where talent money may have been more freely available. However, if we compare overall pay for a season, it is found that a professional in Britain who merely played in half the first team games earned £130+. This would probably have been the maximum for a top level Melbourne pro. The reason for this disparity is the higher match fees and the larger numbers of matches. (These figures were for Surrey which was a relatively wealthy county. They were taken from Sissons, *The Players*, p.113). Equally, there was no winter pay for Melburnian professionals and the season was shorter. A word of warning should be put over this comparison. Australia and Britain were different societies with different scales and standards of living making any comparison between them difficult. The pound was steady and we must assume that an Australian pound and pound Sterling were exchangeable at similar rates. This assumption has been made on the same basis as the comparison between peak wealth-holders in W.D. Rubinstein, 'Entrepreneurial Effort and Entrepreneurial Success: Peak Wealth-holding in Three Societies, 1850-1939', in Rubinstein, *Elites and the Wealthy in Modern Britain*. Nevertheless, there would have been differences in standards of living, both in real and relative terms.

3 Thus following a typical pattern of employment for ex-professionals, established in Sissons, *The Players*, pp.140-3.

4 The wages might also have been linked to conditions within the economy as a whole. If this was so it was only in an indirect way. If the club, as an employer, was generating enough income to support itself, it could ignore economic conditions in a way that a manufacturer could not. It did not have to react to the stimuli of the market place, but it could benefit from high unemployment, in that this

club employed Cosstick only, paying him £3 a week, while in 1879-80, following losses made on the Harris tour and a very small rise in membership, the wages of the three full time professionals were slashed from £3 to £2, a considerable drop. In this instance they refused to take the cut and the club compromised by offering them part-time work on the ground in addition to their duties as bowlers, for an extra £1.¹ For the few years following this wages remained depressed despite the boom in the Melbourne economy. This was not due to the declining popularity of cricket at that time, but to the increasing popularity of the club itself, which caused a rapidly rising members role. It seems that the committee parsimoniously attempted to employ more professionals for the same amount of money. By 1886 the club had once again upped its wage rates. Thus the likes of Phillips were paid more than they had been in the early part of that decade (£2 10/-), while in the following years such wages rose back to the £3 mark. Looking at Tables 6.1 a-b, it is possible to see the highs and lows of prospective expenditure and average wages. The wages appear to have reached a peak in the late 1880s and the early 1890s, but following the depression there is a definite slump. For example, the figure for 1893 shows a prospective expenditure figure that was £2 down on the previous year. By the following year the figure had fallen to a trough of £348. The same is true of average wages. The one figure that does not fall significantly is the numbers employed by the club. The reason for this is that they decided to employ more part-time rather than full-time staff. Since the late 1870s they had always signed up a number of low paid part-time workers, but it was not until the 1890s that they became the most significant members of the ground-staff. By 1892 they employed 5 out of 10 professionals on wages of £1 10/- a week. The following year, the figure had risen to 7 out of 10,² while the figure for 1896 was even more pronounced at 8 out of 9 on this wage structure. By 1898 there was a slight reversal with 3 out of 13 being paid £2 or more, but this still left the other 10 with a wage that was to all intents and purposes only equivalent to that of an unskilled manual worker.³

created the conditions whereby more working men applied for work in cricket. This in turn had the potential to depress wages, as is self-evident, although this potential was not always realised, possibly for reasons of paternalism.

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 19, 23, and 30 Sept. 1879. This condition was accepted by Cosstick and Terry, but T.Kendall refused.

2 Although Cotter, who was being paid this amount, was also given 5/- a match.

3 The financial position of these professionals was not dissimilar to lowest paid ground-staff at English counties, except that they had to work less hours for the money. Vamplew, *Pay up and Play the Game*, pp.219. At Lancashire, most professionals were paid in a wage band of £2-3. However, in 1889, 1 Professional out of 8 was paid a wage of £1. 15/-. In 1895, 1 out of 18 earned wages this low, while in 1901 the figure was 1 out of 24. At Leicestershire, where there was a greater spectrum of wages, in 1896 6 out of 7 were employed on a wage of £1.15/- or less. This figure declined in 1902, with 2 out of 10 being paid a mere £1.10/-, but increased in 1911 when 5 professionals out of 13 were paid £1.5/-

Table 6.1a: Professionals at the Melbourne CC 1860-1883 - Numbers, Expenditure and Range of wages for each Season¹

Season ²	No. ³	Expend. (£) ⁴	Av. (£) ⁵	Range (£) ⁶
1860/1	2	132	66	36-96
1861/2	3	150	50	nf
1862/3	nf (a)	nf	nf	nf
1863/4	3	nf	nf	nf
1864/5	4	480	120	48-300(b)
1865/6	1 (c)	160	160	160
1866/7	1 (d)	160	160	160
1867/8	3	192	64	48-84
1868/9	2	150	75	75
1869/0	nf	nf	nf	nf
1870/1	nf	nf	nf	nf
1871/2	1	72	72	72
1872/3	nf	nf	nf	nf
1873/4	1	78	78	78
1874/5	1	78	78	78
1875/6	2 (e)	144	72	72
1876/7	nf	nf	nf	nf
1877/8	3	168	56	48-72
1878/9	3	216	72	72
1879/0	5	288	58	24-72
1880/1	4	144	36	24-48
1881/2	3	96	32	24-48
1882/3	5	174	35	24-48
Total/mean ⁷	3	173	60	24-300

Source: *Minutes of Melbourne CC*

(a) 'nf' = No figure/ or data unavailable.

(b) The figure of £300 was paid for a year, not a 24 week season.

(c) The position was offered to Cosstick, but he declined to take the offer. It is possible that another professional was employed.

(d) This was paid for a whole year rather than a 24 week season.

(e) In this year Terry was brought over from England, but his wages are not included in the figure. It is likely that he was employed on a similar wage to the others, i.e. £3 per week.

or less. Given the fact that the Melbourne men were on part-time and had access to talent money, their position might be seen as relatively better than English professionals but, as previously noted, there were other conditions which make this an illusion, i.e. absence of winter pay.

1 This table is supposed to be indicative rather than definitive. Nevertheless, it gives a good impression of the number of professionals employed and the wages they were paid over the season. N.B. The figure does not include the groundsmen or pavilion-keepers.

2 Taken as a 24 week period, although this figure did vary.

3 Number of professionals hired at the beginning of the year. This does not include those hired during the season, as when this occurred the *Minutes* frequently did not record the wage, or any other data on the player in question.

4 Proposed expenditure for the year. Expenditure would often be greater because of talent money etc.

5 Average proposed expenditure for the year.

6 Range of wages, taken as the highest and lowest figure.

7 This figure is the mean for the whole period, taken per annum. These are calculated to the nearest whole.

Table 6.1.b: Professionals at the Melbourne CC, 1883-1900¹

Season	No.	Expend.(£)	Av. (£)	Range (£)
1883/4	7	216	31	30-54
1884/5	nf	nf	nf	
1885/6	nf	nf	nf	nf
1886/7	6	284	48	nf
1887/8	6	312	52	36-50
1888/9	5	252	50	36-72
1889/0	8	420	53	36-72
1890/1	10	510	51	36-72
1891/2	8	420	53	36-72
1892/3	10	468	47	36-72
1893/4	10	456	46	36-72
1894/5	9	nf	nf	36-72
1895/6	nf	nf	nf	nf
1896/7	9	348	39	36-60
1897/8	nf	nf	nf	nf
1898/9	13	494	38	24-48
1899/0	11	452	41	36-54
Total/mean	9	387	45	24-72

Source: *Minutes of Melbourne CC*

The conditions of employment for the part-time professionals were quite simple. The first to be employed was G.Coulthard in 1879 and he was required to bowl to members between 5 and 7 pm on weekdays, as well as playing in matches when wanted. Like the 'top' professionals they were entitled to supplement their income by coaching ^{during} the hours ^{in which} they were not employed. For this they were allowed to charge 3/- an hour. It is difficult to discover if this privilege was used and, indeed, whether there was much demand for this particular service. However, it would have been possible for many of these men to hold other employment besides cricket and this might have supplemented their earnings. Cricket, though, may well have been the major livelihood of most of these part-timers and the playing of the game would have supplemented their income above their normal earnings. This was particularly true due to the system of awarding talent money, which was akin to that which was established by the English first-class counties.² A good professional could make a considerable sum during a spell of good form. By the late 1870s talent money was well established and in the season of 1880-81 the amounts that were awarded for good performances

1 All categories, figures and calculations are similar to Table 6.1a.

2 Like many of the other institutions that the Melbourne CC introduced, this was a reproduction of an English system. Talent money became an important supplement to professional wages in Britain, and at the Melbourne CC. Remarkably, the scale of payment that was established at Melbourne was similar to the English example. Thus in 1892, both Yorkshire and Melbourne CC were paying £1 for 50 runs. However, Yorkshire only paid 30/- for a score of 75, and gave £1 for six wickets. See, Sissons, *The Players*, p.102.

were set out. For example, fifty runs in a 'first class' match would earn a professional £1 and further to that he received 1/- for every run over 50 up to a maximum of 80. That meant if he scored 80 or over he received £2 10/-, equivalent to another week's income for the 'top' professionals. Bowlers could receive similar amounts of money, the figure being laid down as £2 for 7 wickets in an innings. For a very good player this would mean a considerable increase in earning potential. For example, in January 1891, Phillips was awarded 5 guineas for 4 separate performances. However, talent money was reduced in the 1890s, with good performances being awarded less money than previously. In 1897 Leith was awarded a guinea for scoring 147 runs against North Melbourne CC, while Mickey Roche, who had a very successful but short career with Middlesex CCC, was given the same amount for taking 7 wickets against St.Kilda. Talent money had been halved. This appears to have been the result of the 1890s crash which, while it did not affect the membership of the club greatly, allowed the committee to depress the wages and awards of professionals.¹

As in England, there were other bonuses that were given to staff in general, including one that was often given at Christmas.² Other things that might be rewarded were good performances in cricket matches outwith the auspices of the club, for colony or country. Throughout the 1860s Wills and Cosstick were rewarded for deeds which gave the club reflected glory. The sum that was given in these cases was often in excess of £5. Likewise, in 1891, Phillips was guaranteed an extra £5 if he played for Victoria in the intercolonial matches. But again, these kind of bonuses were only open to the 'top' men. There was also, for the long-term employee, the possibility of a benefit, although this was extremely rare. In 1868, after the death of George Marshall, the committee agreed to give his widow a benefit. Much the same was done for T.W.Wills in the 1872-73 season, after the club had refused to re-employ him. However, the case of Cosstick's benefit is the most instructive of all as it demonstrates the stormy character that was the hallmark of his with the club and was the only occasion that the club cancelled a benefit for disciplinary reasons.

Cosstick was a long term employee, having first arrived in 1860 fresh from England. Over the years he was involved in several clashes relating to discipline and drunkenness, and in 1865 he actually left the club and went to Sydney for a short while, but on his return was re-employed. He was in dispute with the committee on

¹ It has to be pointed out that much more work is required in this particular area. For example, while many of the professional^s will have played for the club, often this might have been for one of the lower teams, meaning that the chances to earn talent money were not nearly as extensive. Equally, it is clear that the better a professional was, the more likely he was to earn talent money. Thus, it was the 'top' men who were most likely to supplement their income from this source.

² Sissons, *The Players*, pp.104-5. In England it took the form of an end of season benefit.

several occasions, including one in 1869 which involved his wages being substantially docked. There is a record of him claiming the sum of £11 10/- 'for services rendered'.¹ Of this £6 10/- were wages for the first two weeks of March, while the extra £5 was a bonus for playing in two matches, one against Tasmania, the other against the Aborigines XI.² The committee was not pleased about his action in making the claim, feeling that he was being impertinent, and referred the matter to the club solicitor V.L.Cameron.³ He decided against the claim, but Cosstick was granted 2 guineas talent money. Cosstick, who was present at the decision, 'sulkily left the office without making any definite reply'.⁴ Once again it is the language which speaks down the years to the modern observer. The word 'sulkily' suggests the petulance of a child, which is obviously how they treated Cosstick. Furthermore, other attempts he made to claim money were rejected. Thus in May 1871, following a game for Victoria against New South Wales he claimed £2 11/- for 'further expenses'. This time Cameron recommended that the money be paid but, in what constitutes a virulent reprimand of ^{the} recommendation and Cosstick's ^{claim} club president D.C.McArthur stated 'that in the event of the case going into court, he would himself willingly pay £5 towards any costs that might be incurred'.⁵

The case of Cosstick's benefit was in this mould. In 1875, he had served the club for 15 years, with one break 10 years previously. Thus, by the precedents of the English Counties, he would have been entitled to claim a benefit under the customary practice that 10 years service was often rewarded by such a 'gift'.⁶ The cricket club chose to follow this precedent and in October he was granted the proceeds of an exhibition match. A game against the socially prestigious Bohemians was planned for the occasion.⁷ However, by the beginning of November, plans had been changed, and

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 July 1869.

2 The Aborigines XI was, in 1868, the first Australian team to tour Britain. For information on this fascinating subject see Mulvaney, Harcourt, *Cricket Walkabout*.

3 Who was also a long standing committee member.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 July 1869.

5 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 18 May 1871.

6 Cosstick's benefit was a rare example in Melbourne of something that had disappeared by the end of the period. Benefits were a crucial part of the English county scene and were used in the same way as a method of disciplining. Sissons, *The Players*, pp.127-43.

7 The Bohemians were a group of men from the Melbourne elite who were connected with the Melbourne CC and East Melbourne CC. They were led by lawyer Daniel Wilkie, who was ex-Scotch College and a member of both cricket clubs. He was the son of Dr. D.Wilkie, who was an eminent Presbyterian physician. The family were prestigious enough to be included in *Mowle's Pioneers*, a book that listed the great pioneer families of Australia. Other members included Andrew Loughnan, whose family were also represented in *Mowle's* and William McEvoy, who was connected with the committee of the Melbourne CC. See P.C.Mowle, *A Genealogical History of Pioneer Families of Australia*, (Angus and Robertson, Sydney 1969).

the secretary 'was instructed to write to Cosstick for an explanation of his conduct in leaving the ground that afternoon without permission and also being on the E.M.C.C. cricket ground the Thursday after/before [sic]'. At the same time, by way of punishment, 'it was resolved that the match against the Bohemians be not for Cossticks [sic] benefit, & that there be no charge'.¹ Undoubtedly this was disciplinary, although whether the crime was being absent from work, or consorting with the club's number one enemy, the East Melbourne, or both, one cannot be sure.²

Because he was such a long term employee there were many occasions when Cosstick was disciplined. More often than not he was reprimanded for the 'crime' of drunkenness. Much the same was true of Wills while he was employed as the club 'tutor', although petulance and sulkiness were not descriptions that were used of him. However, many of the other professionals were severely warned or dismissed for indiscipline or impertinence. For example, Spooner was sacked in 1884 for 'abusive behaviour and bad language'.³ Earlier in the season Logan had been sacked for 'continued' absence.⁴ It can be no coincidence that this was the first year that a strict code of behaviour was introduced to ensure that the professionals were behaving themselves. Thus in September 1883 the Match and Ground committee ordered that the secretary should be entrusted with increased surveillance of the ground bowlers, to ensure that they were not 'shirking work'. They also made sure that professionals did not smoke on the ground and that they were properly dressed when bowling.⁵ This was an attempt to guarantee respectable behaviour by the club professionals. Furthermore, it was laid down for the first time 'that professionals when not bowling...be employed in either fielding, or in taking charge of the members entrance gate', which demonstrates that the club wanted to maximise work done by them.⁶ From this time onwards discipline and punishment increased. Thus in 1888, Greig was charged with being 'uncivil and insolent' by a member of the club and was dismissed; a fate that had not befallen Coulthard when he had been charged with the same 'crime' in 1882.⁷ Once again the language used towards club employees in the *Minutes* was

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 Nov. 1875.

2 Eventually, despite the debacle of 1875, they granted him a benefit which raised nearly £100 through gate money and subscriptions. By the time the results of the benefit were through Cosstick was in dire 'want of money' and had to take a £2 advance. See *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 13 May 1880.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 9 Jan. 1884.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 5 Nov. 1883.

5 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 Sept. 1883.

6 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 Oct. 1883. It might also be said that this was a deliberate rejection of any claim that the professionals made to the privileges of skilled labour. Thus, professionals were reduced to mere general factotums.

7 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 6 Feb. 1888.

indicative of attitudes to class. It was the language of teacher to children; social superior to social inferior.

Due to the nature of paternalism, to be effective the whip of discipline had to be supplemented by the carrot of benevolence. In this way the club again replicated the customs of their English counterparts. Whereas they were unable to grant many benefits, because few of the employees remained at the club for 10 years, they more often granted money to infirm groundsmen and professionals. When J.Bryant fell ill in 1863 they paid him a bonus of £15 partially to cover lost income. They were also prepared to advance money to players like Cosstick, who was frequently in debt. In 1880 a subscription list was opened for George Coulthard, although the committee refused to contribute 3 guineas from club funds.¹ They were also prepared to grant the ground to Richard Coulstock for a benefit, despite the fact he was not one of the club's professionals.

This paternalistic aspect to present and past employees was best seen in actions towards a former employee on the ground-staff, S.Borders.² In 1875 they received a plea for assistance from Borders who was 'in circumstances of distress, he having lost a horse on which his means of livelihood depended'. The committee reacted by granting him £2 towards the purchase of a new horse.³ By 1886, they had re-employed Borders as a groundsman, but by June he was almost incapable of working. Therefore 'it was resolved to recommend that his services be dispensed with [;] that a gratuity of £50 be granted to him[;] and that his son be permanently employed on the ground on the understanding that he should contribute to the support of his father'.⁴ This was not the exact outcome. Borders made a further request that his wife should be bought a mangle in lieu of the £50 donation, presumably so she would be able to take in washing work. This was done and Borders was paid the £7 balance. The case of Borders was the most extreme example of the paternalism of the Melbourne CC committee, but the ideology that motivated their actions was not uncommon. For example, on another occasion, in 1883, one of the ground bowlers injured himself and consequently tendered his resignation. His injury was a direct result of cricket and the committee decided to pay him a week's wages and then to keep him employed on light work until

¹ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 13 July 1880.

² Borders was not actually a professional bowler. He was a mere worker on the ground, but was employed for many years by the club.

³ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 11 May 1875.

⁴ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 26 June 1886.

he had recovered.¹ In the same month £10 was voted from club funds to help Coulthard again, who had not been working for 9 months due to illness.²

Undoubtedly, the club was generally 'fair-minded' towards its employees, neatly balancing the two components of paternalism. Occasionally their behaviour appears heavy-handed, especially in the case of the pavilion keeper R.Newberry, who was dismissed for negligence in 1880. Newberry had served the club for many years and there was an outcry from the general membership who demanded that he be given some sort of parting gift. It also occasioned an impassioned attack from the editor of *The Australasian*, who dwelt on the 'impecuniosity of the leading club' and its ungenerosity in giving neither Newberry nor Cosstick a gratuity.³ A letter to the same paper accused the committee of arrogance and insulting the members in having shifted the time of a special meeting convened by the members for the purpose of repairing the committee's lapse of paternal care.⁴ But on the whole they acted with the discretion of truly paternal employers. However, it must be stated, that this was an ideology that operated upon the basis of strict social conservatism, emphasising the master/servant relationship and the concomitant amateur/professional dichotomy. Indeed, although professionalism was never fully established along English lines in Australia, the amateur/professional divide existed in full force within the confines of the Melbourne CC.⁵

The simple fact of the matter was that the club regarded professionals as second-class citizens, an attitude that was strengthened by the knowledge that while the professionals were fairly good cricketers they were not the best in the country. The club would not pay enough to guarantee keeping top players, a situation that was exacerbated by the amount of money that Australian XI players could earn through their joint-stock company tours of Britain and Australia. As it was, the experience of hiring Caffyn at £300 pa in 1864 nearly bankrupted the club at a time when it had neither enough members nor enough income through gate-money to employ him. Some of the guarantors of the scheme refused to pay when Caffyn left, leaving the club without a top-draw professional and with large debts.⁶ It then had to re-evaluate its position on the employment of professionals and for a few years made do with the services of Cosstick and Wills.

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 & 9 Jan. 1883.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 30 Jan. 1883.

3 Report from *Australasian*, pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 May 1880.

4 Letter from *Australasian*, pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 May 1880.

5 Through the whole of this period paternalism remained a marked and important feature of the attitudes of the club. For example, a friendly society for cricketers was established by the club in 1893.

6 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 24 Feb., 10 Mar., 30 Mar., 8 Apr., 8 Sept. 1864.

Despite the episode with Caffyn, the club remained obsessed with the idea of bringing out professionals from England to bolster its playing strength and prestige. However, they could or would not offer enough money. In 1875 they contacted the colossus of English cricket, W.G. Grace, for the purpose of signing up a professional, but were disappointed by the reply 'that the terms offered by the club were too low to induce any English professional to accept the position offered'.¹ This was an overstatement as the club were able to obtain the services of Terry from England. However, the essence of Grace's statement was correct. No English professional of *quality* would coach for the club because they could not provide a sufficiently high salary. However, if this was true in the mid-1870s when the entrepreneurial XIs still provided an independent and relatively steady income for many of the professionals in England, it was less true of the late 70s and early 1880s when the county clubs were becoming ascendant. At this time attempts were made to secure the services of some of the best professionals in England, like Ulyett, Emmett, and even Alfred Shaw. None of these attempts met with success, presumably because the club was still unwilling to pay enough to entice them from their mother country. Thus they settled for professionals like Jim Phillips and Mickey Roche, both fine players, but also Australians who were slightly below the very highest level.

It is unsurprising, given the club's determination yet failure to sign English professionals, that they regarded their own Australians as a distinctly lower form of life. Imbued with a belief in the purity of amateur sport they seemed determined to employ professionals and then prevent them from playing in important club games. Although in 1864 Hammersley had declared professionals as a necessary part of the club, there were frequent complaints from within and without about its use of paid cricketers.² In 1879 there were members objecting to the use of professionals³ and there were calls throughout the period to restrict their use. These calls escalated in the 1890s and by 1905 all clubs in Melbourne decided that professionals should be restricted to 2 in a team for competition matches.⁴ These objections were based on class and not on the fear that because professionals earned their living from cricket they were better at the game. They wanted to reject the use of professionals because, in their bourgeois

¹ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 Sept. 1875.

² *B.L.V.*, (30 Jan. 1864).

³ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 1 Dec. 1879.

⁴ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Oct. 1895, there was a recommendation that the professionals be selected as little as possible. *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 Mar. 1905.

minds, the amateur ideal was superior to the worldly reality of working-class cricketers.¹

VI

Visiting teams: the club, shamateurism and professionalism

Although the club seemed to feel that English professionals were superior to their Australian counterparts, this did not mean that it had a non-paternalist attitude towards them. Indeed, it viewed them with the same condescension as did the cricketing authorities in England. The club seemed explicitly to condone the attitudes of English aristocrats like Lord Hawke to professionals, and were prepared to bend over backwards to satisfy the class-prejudices of illustrious visitors. Stood accused by Hawke's stinging criticisms of colonial society and its attitude to class on the cricket field the club could confidently and honestly raise a cry of 'not guilty':

It is rather curious that the Australians themselves do not realise that our professionals prefer to be "on their own" off the field rather than to be in the same hotel as the amateurs. Indeed, I know that some of our professionals would prefer to have second-class passages on board ship rather than having to dress each night for dinner. This is not in the least diminishing the perfect accord between English amateurs and professionals....it is merely the statement of a psychological fact, which seems to puzzle our friends in the Antipodes and which to us, within the group of English cricket, is quite comprehensible and rational.²

1 It might be argued that employing and playing professionals was a waste of time and money if there was no dearth of good amateurs. However, what had happened in Australia was that a two-tiered situation had developed. If a cricketer was from the top-drawer, then he could make enough money from cricket by playing as an amateur for the Australian XI without having to stoop to the level of a club servant. Some others, however, chose to play cricket as a career choice, presumably because they found cricket a better employment prospect than any other job. There were several very fine professional cricketers in Melbourne. For example, Mickey Roche, a South Australian who was brought to Melbourne by the Melbourne CC. He appears not to have been good enough for the Australian team. He was, however, good enough for Middlesex CCC who hired him. Albert Trott was another example of an out-and-out professional from Melbourne. He did represent Australia, but then he signed to Middlesex as a professional. Strangely he never played for Australia again, which might have been a case of the XI operating a policy of not selecting real professionals. Whatever, there was a market for the skills of a professional player, especially when they could be used as net bowlers and general dogs-bodies. However good or bad they were, attempts to exclude them were definitely attempts to impose some type of class bar.

2 Hawke, *Recollections and Reminiscences*, p.98. This is, for Hawke, a rather subtle dig at Australia and Australians. In fact what he is accusing them of is not understanding the nature of class. But more importantly, as will be seen below, the Melbourne CC had a very similar outlook to class themselves. Nevertheless, Hawke's comments about professionals have to be considered in the light of the fact that the first Marylebone CC team to Australia, captained by Warner in 1903-04, all travelled first-class, and all stayed in the same hotels. Warner claimed that this was to enhance team spirit and solidarity. It may have also had something to do with the fact that there were only 3 amateurs on the team, and it might have been regarded as a necessary measure to maintain discipline. See P.F. Warner, *How We*

To many Australians within the dominant class the division between amateur and professional must have appeared entirely understandable and psychologically preferable. Undoubtedly, there was a vein of thought in colonial society that was highly critical of the amateur/professional dichotomy and sections of the press, and others, criticised the protagonists of tours to Australia for perpetuating something that supposedly would not be tolerated in Australia.¹ These critics would have included men within the governing class; radical liberals and other believers in an 'open society'. They were people who wanted to keep such 'un-Australian' practice in check. But they were not members of the Melbourne CC committee, and did not belong to the powerful group of social conservatives who always played a reactionary part in Australian politics and society. Thus they were in no position to curb the behaviour of the club towards the professionals of England and Australia.

After the tours of the 1860s, the cricket club began to show a distinct bias towards bringing out amateur teams to tour Australia. At the same time they began to display signs of wanting to curb the profit-making ventures of the professional touring teams. It was in this way that the club most visibly came down on the side of pure amateur values. In May 1872, a special meeting of the club was called for the purpose of organising a scheme to bring out an English XI. D.C.McArthur spoke for many when he said 'his idea...was that the cricketers of the colony would prefer seeing the team composed solely of gentlemen players', and at the same time stressed that they would not mind if some of 'their professional bowlers' came with them, if that was absolutely necessary.² This clearly indicates the priorities of the gentlemen of the Melbourne CC. Once the scheme was launched they declared they were satisfied to receive a combination of gentlemen and 'their' bowlers (note the use of the possessive), but continued to nurture the idea of a purely gentlemanly team. Unfortunately for them

Recovered The Ashes, (Chapman and Hall, London 1904), p.43. Warner does not actually mention that there were disciplinary reasons for the decision preferring to explain it in terms of promoting a feeling that 'you are all one side, working together to a common end'. Nevertheless, Warner's record as a disciplinarian is such to suggest that this was, in part, one of the reasons for this decision. It has been said of him that he was a very good man-manager and was generally well-respected by the professionals at Middlesex, but that he did on one occasion order his senior professional to give another professional 'six of the best' with a hair brush for an error in the field. See, Howat, *Plum Warner*, p.50.

1 F.Laver, *An Australian Cricketer on Tour. Reminiscences, Impressions, and Experiences of Two Trips*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1905), p.274: 'The English custom of amateur cricketers entering the field from one gate, and professional cricketers from another seems, to all Australians, priggish and out of place'. Also see comments of J.H.Phillips made in 1899 and quoted in Mandle, 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism', p.242.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 May 1872.

this proved impossible to arrange in the near future and they actually had to settle for a professional team captained and exploited by W.G.Grace.¹

Nevertheless the Holy Grail of amateurism was vigorously pursued a few years later with a plan by the club to bring out a pure amateur team under I.D.Walker. They made contact with him in 1877 and a general meeting in October empowered the committee to enter into negotiations with him.² These proved extremely protracted and it was decided at another meeting the following year that if these fell through then the club was to make arrangements with James Southerton for a professional team to come out under its auspices.³ This was unnecessary. Walker soon telegraphed his acceptance and arrangements were immediately commenced. In the end the team brought two professionals with them to strengthen the side's bowling weakness. These two were consequently housed in different hotels to the gentlemen amateurs.⁴ But the true attitude of the club can be seen in the welcome speech made by the club president J.G.Francis at the Victoria Club. He stated that 'Australians gloried in rather than were ashamed of, the fact that one of the greatest defeats of the Australians in England was inflicted by the Gentlemen of England (cheers)'.⁵

The tour was not a financial success, perhaps because the team was somewhat weaker than previous visiting XIs. In other aspects it was near disastrous, particularly with the Sydney 'riot' and Harris's duplicity over the affair. The damage was limited for the club because the events concerned had occurred in Sydney. They seemed to regard the whole venture as a success, although the statement that 'indirectly the visit...cannot be over-estimated' smacks of slight disappointment.⁶ Nevertheless, the relative failure of the tour did not discourage the club from further efforts to bring amateur/gentleman cricketers before the Australian public. Following the visit of another professional XI in 1880-81, the club invited the Hon. Ivo Bligh, to bring out a team. This time they wanted a slightly more balanced eleven, allowing a ceiling of four professionals. This suggested that they were attempting to get a side more attractive to the shilling-spectator than previously. However, this plan ran into trouble when Alfred Lyttelton, whom the club regarded as one of the major draws of the tour, dropped out and Bligh wanted him replaced with a fifth professional.⁷ Following this 'bombshell' the committee decided that the club should not sanction Bligh's team and decided to

1 He received £1500 and expenses. Each member of his team received about a tenth of that figure.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 22 Oct. 1877.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 Apr. 1878.

4 The team was also captained by Lord Harris as Walker was unable to come to Australia due to a family bereavement.

5 *Wisden's Cricketers' Almanack for 1880*, p.24.

6 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 6 Sept. 1879.

7 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 May 1882.

withdraw from their commitment to back the visit. Clearly they felt that the decision to bring another professional compromised the ideological purpose of the tour.¹ Despite this sudden rush of blood, the tour did go ahead under the banner of the Melbourne CC, having managed to persuade the members of the Australian XI not to play together in Victoria or Sydney except against the English team. This measure ensured that the trip would not be ruined financially by a surfeit of cricket caused by the independent Australian team arranging matches against each of the colonies.²

The obsession with amateur teams continued and resulted in the financial disaster of 1887-88 when two separate XIs toured Australia, one being the amateur team under Vernon, the other a professional outfit led by Shaw and Shrewsbury. The motives for organising yet another amateur led and organised team, as well as bringing it to the country in a year when there would be competition from a professional team, lies in the club's belief that cricket in Australia had been stagnated by constant visits from entrepreneurial, exploitative professionals. Thus, according to F.G.Smith, a visit by gentlemen would 'awaken interest in cricket'.³

Notwithstanding the committee's decision, the NSWCA had decided to invite Shaw and Shrewsbury, and neither side would back down in a conflict that began to assume all the hallmarks of intense intercolonial rivalries. The most significant move that the club made to break the back of the Sydney plan was to attempt to entice W.G.Grace to Australia with an offer of £2000, which they were even prepared to increase if the price was not right. The decision to go to such a high figure was a deliberate attempt to forestall Shaw and Shrewsbury, as G.F.Vernon, the manager of the amateur XI, had advised Melbourne that securing Grace would result in the withdrawal of Shaw.⁴ On top of this the club were also prepared to pay £800 to another star amateur, W.W.Read. These efforts were, in part, an attempt to prevent financial failure, but at the same time they were made out of a commitment to amateur cricket. Like the English authorities they were prepared to tolerate a class-based professionalism. They were evidently aware of the shamateur shenanigans of Grace and Read, and so were colluding with them. They were consciously admitting that despite paying the colossus of cricket, he had to remain outwardly untainted, amateur and bourgeois. Had they not participated in this quirk of Victorian class ideology, they

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 26 June 1882.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 & 11 July 1882. It was felt that too much competition between different units would stifle gate-takings. This demonstrates the complexities of Australian cricket.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 29 Jan. 1887. He added 'it would bring a considerable sum to the coffers of the club', which demonstrates the importance to club finances that such a tour could have. It indicates that there were always other motives at work than the promotion of cricket and its ideology and in this context these motives were financial.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 22 July 1887.

would have denied the ideological basis of nineteenth century Anglo-Saxon society and cricket.

The club lost £3582 15/- 3d. on the tour, but they were able to provide the balance out of general resources. Indeed, the deficit for the whole year was a mere £518, proving the financial strength of the institution at this time. Nevertheless, they had learnt their lesson and no more decisions of this ilk were taken. Neither did they need to make any more mistakes. The debacle of 1887-88 sounded the death-knell of professional entrepreneurialism.¹ From this time onwards they were careful to make alliances with other interests, like the Sydney Cricket Ground (SCG) Trustees, before inviting amateur captains to organise tours to Australia under their auspices.² Indeed, they consciously resisted the possibility of another professional tour to Australia in 1893. On this occasion they united with the SCG Trustees and to forestall 'steps being taken in England by a professional team to come out to the colonies next season' they invited Lord Sheffield to return and if he would not, then to organise jointly a team under their own aegis. This demonstration of unity effectively prevented the arrival on Australian shores of a professional entrepreneurial XI.³

Where professionals came out with the teams captained by amateurs, they suffered second-class treatment from all parties involved. They were boarded in hotels which were not of the same standard as the amateurs.⁴ They received second-class passage on the ships. On Bligh's tour there were doubts as to whether they should be entertained at a farewell banquet, with the decision being left to the sub-committee organising the tour.⁵ As we have seen, some of the amateurs were paid more and on every tour the club was prepared to make its illustrious guests honorary life members, unless cricket was their work. The ultimate case of the operation of the amateur/professional double-standard occurred on the tour of 1901-02 which was organised by the club and led by A.C.Maclaren. Towards the end of the visit,

1 Shaw, Pullin, *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer - His Career and Reminiscences*, p. 101: 'We lost by the enterprise all the money we had made on the previous tours and a good round sum on top of it...The Melbourne CC by inviting out another team incurred an expense of £4,000. This they could afford...Our loss was £2,400...The cricket rivalries of Melbourne and Sydney were our undoing'. Apparently Lillywhite was unable to meet his share of the loss.

2 Montefiore, *"Cricket in the Doldrums"*, p.84. The one exception to this was the tour of Lord Sheffield in 1891-92. He carried an enormous loss of £3000, which was the sum he paid to W.G.Grace. Following this, for the rest of the decade the club was in control of Australian international cricket, and it did not face a challenge to its organisation of tours until 1905 and the formation of the Board of Control, see below, ch.7.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 Jan. 1893.

4 For example, in 1894-95, while in Melbourne the 'gentlemen' were boarded at Scott's Hotel for 12/6d. a night, and the professionals stayed at The White Hart for 7/6d. a night. The scale of payment for hotels was assessed as the same for Sydney.

5 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 13 Nov. 1882.

G.J.Jessop and several of the other amateurs made representations to the club to be granted further allowances, and although 'the committee considered that their agreement had been faithfully and liberally carried out, ...in view of representations made by Messrs.Jessop Jones [sic] & McGahey [it was] decided that an extra donation of £50 be granted to each of the six amateurs and letters be written to them in these terms'.¹ But the club was prepared to go even further to satisfy the wallets and palates of these men.² They paid a wine bill at Scott's Hotel for £41 9/- 8d., which the amateurs had carelessly left behind them, believing that 'though the club is clearly not liable, it would be better in the interests of all concerned, that no unpaid accounts of the kind should be left unsettled'.³ Unfortunately, this was not the committee's reaction to a request by the professionals for unpaid talent money and the possibility of a bonus. The matter was dealt with at the same meeting, where they resolved that:

a reply be sent informing them that any talent money earned at adelaide [sic] on the scale of the tour, will be paid those entitled to it by major wardill [sic] [,] and that as regards bonus [sic] there was no arrangement as to any bonus at all, and that the club never on any occasion paid a bonus of more than £25. The committee express strong disapproval at the terms in which the writers have worded their letter.⁴

It might be fair to assume that the committee's compliance with the question of a bonus to amateurs and the payment of their wine bill was part of a cultural cringe. After all one can be certain that the club knew which side its bread was buttered. These tours were making vast profits for them and perhaps they could not afford to alienate the high-and-mighty amateurs. On the other hand, they could not really afford to alienate the professionals either, as they often constituted the real strength and backbone of touring XIs. In fact, it would be fairer to assume that the Melbourne CC was reacting in the same way as most of the English cricketing authorities. They colluded with shamateurism, they openly sported amateur values and by doing so they demonstrated their support and allegiance for the 'gentlemanly' and chivalric code of amateurism in sport. This was the basis of what the Melbourne CC thought made it great.

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 19 Mar. 1902.

2 It is unlikely that any of the 6 were pure amateurs, and it is known that both Maclaren and Jessop were shamateurs.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 11 Apr. 1902.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 11 Apr. 1902. It is possible that the professionals had got wind of the 'amateurs' claim for extra cash. If they did, it would be interesting to know what their reaction was to treatment that was so offhand.

The primacy of the club

Throughout this period, and beyond it, the Melbourne CC continued to believe in its own superiority above all similar institutions in Australia. This was notwithstanding the disputes of the early twentieth century which were effectively to remove power from the orbit of the club. On every occasion where a public face was shown, the Melbourne CC lost no opportunity to tell the world, or at least Victoria, about its effortless supremacy. This is an important point, not least because some people were prepared to underline the club's assertions and confirm its beliefs that it was the Lord's of the colonies. As will be seen, this was one of the vital ingredients that gave the club power within and even beyond cricketing circles.

We have seen that by aligning itself with the ideology of amateurism the club put itself forward as the premier promoter of English customs, thus enabling it to blow its own trumpet on a very regular basis. When trumpets were blown the statements were extremely revealing, stripping bare the ideology of the club for all to see. The lowest common denominator of all their remarks was that they were more than a cricket club, with duties that extended beyond the rolling acres of the Richmond paddock, wherein lay the site of the rapidly evolving Melbourne (Metropolitan) Cricket Ground (MCG). Thus, at the special meeting of the club to discuss the bringing out of Grace R.W. Wardill was able to say:

The reason the M.C.C. had been asked to move in the matter was because it was thought the proposal would come with a better grace from the leading cricket club of Australia than from any private party or body of speculators (Hear, Hear). It was a guarantee to the gentlemen of England that they would be received and treated in a proper manner.¹

Was this so much hot air? Or was it true? Was the cricket club really the club of gentlemen? Was it the colonial Lord's? Wardill seemed to have an inkling that it was so highly regarded because those who had already subscribed to the scheme 'comprised merchants, squatters, bankers; in fact, the leading men of the city'.²

The Melbourne CC had these men within its ranks, and the committee, although a cross-section of dominant class society, was connected to these circles. Also, at this time, with the club fulfilling the functions of the VCA Wardill could assume that the club wielded more power, and had more social cachet than any other group of cricketers in the colony. But it was not just the club, or people in the colony, who shared his viewpoint. Further afield, in the Northern Hemisphere, fifteen years later,

¹ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 May 1872.

² *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 May 1872.

someone told them that they were regarded as the premier institution in Australia. This view was reported back to the Annual meeting, which was hearing the results of the 1886 Australian XI team, which the club had organised, funded and sent 'home':

The opinion expressed in the report as to international cricket being conducted under the auspices of such a club as this was not confined to Australia. He [the president, F.G.Smith] and others had the opportunity of ascertaining when in England from a leading member of the highest cricketing association in the world, the Marylebone club, that that opinion was shared there.¹

This was no idle boast. There is evidence that the mighty Marylebone saw in the Melbourne CC a kindred spirit and, in a colonial sort of way, an Antipodean *doppelgänger*. Firstly, they had for a number of years been consulting the club about rule changes. Although Marylebone also consulted the VCA there was no escaping the fact that the Melbourne CC was a private institution and by asking their advice and ratification the Marylebone was acknowledging the status of Melbourne. Secondly, and more importantly, the act of sending a cricket team under the aegis of the club to Britain, must have appeared grand and representative of a hegemonic institution. Not only that, the Marylebone welcomed this development with open arms. Australian XI teams were beginning to disturb the cricketing authorities in England because of their money-making activities combined with their insistence that they retain their amateur status. The attitude of the tourists in 1884 had been regarded as financially rapacious and complaints were made by English amateurs and professionals alike. The Marylebone thought, with good reason following the Melbourne's continual promotion of amateur English teams, that a visit under their umbrella was safe from the abuse of filthy entrepreneurial lucre.² The Melbourne CC had approached the 'parliament house of cricket' and had been welcomed with open arms.

The Melbourne CC continued to promote its own superiority, claiming, for example, in 1889, that in a dispute with the association 'they acted purely in the interests of the game they are appointed to foster',³ suggesting that its principle role was not just organising cricket for the purposes of its members, but to protect cricket in Australia from the excesses of other organisations. With the success of English tours to

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 10 Sept. 1887.

2 Initially, when the club had telegraphed the Marylebone, Henry Perkins, the secretary, cabled back, that such a team would not be welcome. He had acted upon his own initiative and the club received another cable on the 14 January saying 'Telegram sent my opinion only - not that of club - they welcome anyone sent by you'. *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Jan. 1886. This suggests that Marylebone would not have welcomed anyone sent by someone else, and it was certainly a rebuttal of the Australian XI joint-stock ventures.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Sept. 1889.

Australia in the 1890s, backed by the club and the SCG Trustees, they obviously felt that they were fulfilling this self-created role. After the tour of Lord Sheffield's team, F.G.Smith told the members that their actions in the past had proved true to the club's 'old traditions as the safe and certain custodians of the interests of cricket in this colony (cheers)'.¹ The word 'traditions' is very telling in that it underlines a number of concepts that the club held about its position within the cricket world and society as a whole. It suggests age, precedence and conservatism, all things which the club saw in itself. In the same way that the empire and the monarchy were traditions, so too was the Melbourne CC within its own, slightly less elevated, sphere.

Even when the club had lost much of its influence, it still insisted that it was somehow 'more than a cricket club, in the sense of playing cricket itself, and the committee had felt that they had had to act to some extent in the interests of public cricket',² a claim it continued to assert to the end of this period. Therefore, despite its defeats in the battles against the cricket associations, and despite its exclusion from competitive cricket, and with an overdraft exceeding £9000, in 1909 it continued to fulfil a paternalistic role by attempting to encourage country, as opposed to metropolitan, cricket.

There were many who supported the club's claim to ascendancy and social prominence during the 1860-1914 period by comparing the Melbourne CC to the Marylebone. Sometimes references happened to be ironic, as in 1880 when *The Australasian* launched its attack upon the insolvent finances of the club, as well as its treatment of old club servants, and said 'here the colonial Lord's cannot even pay expenses, and is always in debt'.³ Others used the description in a more flattering sense. George Giffen said of the club that it was 'the Australian M.C.C. - one of the wealthiest cricket organisations in the world'.⁴ While George Inglis, writing in 1912, said that it was 'an institution with the same initials as, and in a measure corresponding to, the famous English club'.⁵ These statements are significant, not least because they were written by two people with two different views about the club. Giffen was a great supporter of the institution as it had backed the players against the centralist authority of the Australian Cricket Council, which was founded in the early 1890s to regulate Australian international cricket. Inglis, on the other hand, believed that Australian

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 9 Sept. 1892.

2 Sir Leo Cussens, in *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 Sept. 1907.

3 Quoted in the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 May 1880.

4 Giffen, *With Bat and Ball*, p.78.

5 Inglis, *Sport and Pastimes in Australia*, p.119.

cricket should be controlled by such an authority,¹ something which had been established in the form of the Board of Control by the time he wrote this.

VIII Summary

The ideology revealed in this chapter is remarkably unified. The ideology of the committee and club as a whole was the ideology of the upper class in colonial society, with its anglophile tinge, its belief in respectability, class differentiation and the purity of amateur sport. It was an ideology that was upheld and put into practice by the committee. From there it helped to support the idea that the club was socially superior, a colonial Marylebone. In the next chapter, the interaction of these attitudes with the beliefs of other sections of the Victorian and Australian cricketing community will be examined, and the resultant clash will be analysed.

At the centre of this ideology was the Melbourne Cricket Club, which was the sole subscribers to this particular ideology as other cricketing organisations, the Associations in each of the colonies/states, as well as private clubs like the Melbourne CC, shared these beliefs. They all claimed that they had a full property right in them. In all cases the moral tone was Social Darwinism with a dash of Muscular Christianity, emphasising the Anglo-British values of outward respectability and inward morality, as well as the more sincere belief in a vigorous athletic culture.² However, always, a social Darwinism was underpinned by the long-held double-standard of the gentry. It was a social Darwinism that played on the one hand on the other slighted hand of social class, the superior status of gentry and 'aristocracy'.

This chapter examines the meaning within Victorian cricket during the period 1870-1914 from the point of view of the Melbourne CC, but is also not at all of a strictly chronological kind. It looks at the challenges posed by other organisations at each level of inquiry (local, colonial and national), as well as contemporary ideas which the club's club shared. The story of the rise and fall of the Melbourne Cricket Club is intimately connected with the history of Australian cricket because it is not only they are two entities that intersect and intersect and therefore have to be seen in side. By adopting this approach much light is thrown upon the present state of

¹ Chapter 1 and 2, see above.

² Inglis, *Sport and Pastimes in Australia*, p.119.

CHAPTER 7. FOR CLUB, COLONY OR COUNTRY: THE MELBOURNE CC AND THE BATTLE FOR THE CONTROL OF AUSTRALIAN CRICKET

Loyalties to club, colony, country and empire were ultimately connected with each other.¹ These loyalties often caused disruption because of the clashes which arose between different interest groups within the dominant classes. It is now necessary to develop this theme by taking a magnifying glass to the history of cricket in Victoria and providing detailed brush-strokes to an otherwise incomplete picture. As its starting point this will take the 'generative' role of sport and the use that sport could be put to as a tool of social consolidation and advancement, and will then examine the disruption and conflict that arose out of this. Essentially the battle for the control of cricket was a battle between fractions of the Melbourne, Sydney and, to an extent, Adelaide, urban bourgeoisies. The fundamental purpose of this social warfare was self-promotion. It was a peculiar game of cat-and-mouse blended with king-of-the-castle and the result was acrimony which still stinks down the years to the present day.

At the centre of this was the Melbourne CC which, as has been seen, attempted to reproduce the ideology of cricket in its full Anglo-Saxon glory. But they were not the sole subscribers to this particular ideology as other cricketing organisations, like the Associations in each of the colonies/states, as well as private clubs like the East Melbourne CC, shared these beliefs. They all claimed that they had a full proprietary right to them. In all cases the moral tone was Social Darwinistic with a dash of Muscular Christianity, emphasising the neo-Bunyanesque values of outward respectability and inward morality, as well as the more modern belief in a vigorous ethnocentric culture.² But as always, such idealism was undermined by the bourgeois double-standard of the game's ideology, which stressed fair play on the one hand but on the other slighted-hand allowed the 'pragmatic' realities of gamesmanship and 'shamateurism'.

This chapter examines the conflicts within Victorian cricket during the period 1870-1914 from the point of view of the Melbourne CC, but it does not do so in a strictly chronological sense. It looks at the challenges posed by other organisations on each level of loyalty (local, colonial/state and national), as well as demonstrating who were the club's chief allies. The story of the rise and fall of the Melbourne CC is intimately connected with the history of Australian cricket between 1860 and 1914 and they are two stories that inter-twine and intersect and therefore have to be told side by side. By adopting this approach much light is thrown upon the phenomenon of

1 Chapters 1 and 5, see above.

2 Of course, this was sometimes in opposition to the behaviour of crowds and cricket teams themselves, as can be seen in the development of barracking on Australian cricket grounds.

Australian cricket during this era. This re-interpretation challenges, to an extent, the broad nationalism of the Mandle-line, while confirming selected ideas put forward by Stoddart and Montefiore. At the same time, it rejects the belief that the ideology of cricket was utilised as a tool of hegemony by a dominant class imposing it upon a passive subordinate class. The dominant class in Australian cricket control were too fragmented and too involved in their own disputes to impose any such ideology more than partially. At the same time it notes that oppositional forms of behaviour relating to the crowd (i.e. barracking) were developed as a separate pattern of cultural behaviour that was more-or-less unacceptable to the norms of the dominant group. The history of the Melbourne CC and its committee goes a long way to demonstrating all this.

I

Opposition and Allies at the Local Level

The East Melbourne CC and the VCA

Between 1868 and 1875 the Melbourne CC had control of the functions of the VCA.¹ During this period it came in for heavy criticism from other Victorian cricket clubs and the press, mostly due to what was perceived as a biased selection policy for intercolonial matches.² The VCA was eventually reformed in 1875, when the Melbourne CC agreed to hand over its functions to the new representative body. The initiative seems to have been taken by the South Melbourne CC, which suggested a meeting between the delegates of the big three. W.H.Handfield actually submitted the scheme that was adopted, suggesting that the Melbourne CC was happy to see this new body take-over.³ With the club's abdication from its powerful role a new balance of

1 On 15 September 1868 the *Minutes* record that the committee were going to propose that 'the financial management of the intercolonial cricket matches and athletic sports meetings' be taken over by the club and this was agreed to at a special meeting of the VCA on the 26 September that was presided over by Melbourne CC stalwart D.S.Campbell. In doing so the club guaranteed that it would arrange fixtures with New South Wales and Tasmania, as well as running the sports meetings which were currently organised by the VCA.

2 For example the first match committee that the club appointed for the intercolonial match of 1868 consisted of R.W.Wardill, W.J.Hammersley and T.W.Wills, all prominent members of the club. By December all three had resigned due to criticism in *The Age*, (28 Nov. 1868), p.3, which suggested that they would be highly biased to the interests of the club. 'Now that the Association is dead, it is high time that cricketers should be up and doing, or else what ought to be regarded as a national struggle will simply become one between the Melbourne Club and the Sydney or Tasmania teams', said the paper's correspondent. Further examples of this occurred in 1870 when *The Age* accused the club of 'supineness and neglect'. *The Age*, (25 Feb. 1870).

3 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 21 Sept. 1875. This is hardly surprising, as the Melbourne CC had found the functions of the VCA to be troublesome, causing financial loss. For example, in 1870, the match against New South Wales had only realised £34 8/- 6d, while in that year the previously lucrative sports meetings had not come off due to bad weather. The committee estimated that the loss over 2 years had been a substantial £293 14/- 3d and they concluded that the intercolonial matches could

power was created which revolved around who held the balance on the Association. In this respect the key figure was often the secretary of the VCA, who seems, over the years, to have been drawn from the newer E.Melbourne-S.Melbourne axis. Consequently, men like H.H.Budd (East Melbourne) and E.H.Heather (South Melbourne), held a substantial amount of power when they acted as secretary of the VCA and were able to grind axes with the Melbourne CC, attacking the hegemony of the club. In opposition to these attacks the Melbourne CC had their ground and their prestige, factors that in the long run outweighed the strength of their opponents.

With the reconstitution of the VCA in 1875 a more effective forum of dispute was created. The early 1870s had seen the other two cricket clubs challenge the power and prestige of the Melbourne. The South and East Melbourne clubs consistently outplayed their older relation during this period and at the same time developed facilities that were conscious attempts to rival its opulence. This challenge can actually be seen within the confines of the Melbourne CC itself, for due to the social prestige that was supposedly attached to membership, many people belonged to it as well as one of the other clubs. Of course, it would be their own natural inclinations and loyalties that led to the decision as to whether they were primarily supporters of the 'premier' institution or one of its 'offspring'. Thus at a special general meeting in 1875, called to discuss the prickly question of employing professionals, a bizarre exchange occurred between H.C.A.Harrison and other members of the club. Harrison was resolutely opposed to the use of professionals and a firm believer in the amateur code and at the meeting he expressed

- "The best club in the colonies had never had a professional."
- "Which?" came the replies.
- "East Melbourne", retorted Harrison. Upon which several members shouted "South Melbourne".¹

Harrison was a die hard supporter of the Melbourne CC and was merely expressing an opinion, however the cries of 'South Melbourne' suggest that some of the meeting were not completely loyal to the causes of the Melbourne.

A similar pattern to this occurred at a meeting called just over a year later in 1876. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss proposed improvements to the ground and a large body of the principal members were gathered together to decide how to raise £7000 for building a new pavilion and grandstand, as well as effecting other improvements. The president, D.C.McArthur opened the meeting, saying that the

not be made to pay, *Minutes of A.G.M.*, 10 Sept. 1870. For a while they dabbled with using subscriptions to subsidise the fixture but continued to make a considerable loss.

¹ *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 23 Mar. 1875.

improvements were needed because 'the club had not maintained the position which it ought to have done as the premier club in the colony'.¹ The meeting appeared to be on an even keel and the proposal for raising the money by debentures was laid out for all to see. A motion to this effect had been passed with only two voices of dissent. But one of the voices was that of H.H.Budd, secretary of the East Melbourne and the VCA, who preceded to launch a vicious and scathing assault upon the Melbourne CC, an institution of which he had been a long-time member. The basis of what was undoubtedly a highly contentious speech was that the figures that the club had provided for the meeting were wrong because they did not take into account payments that ought to be made to clubs playing the Melbourne CC on the MCG. But not only that, he suggested that the Melbourne CC had no right to expect that important cricket matches be played on their ground:

If the East Melbourne had played the Melbourne on the Melbourne ground they would expect 2d. out of every 6d. drawn. They might be refused it, but they would not play without it. ("No, No").

Then, again, they took it for granted that the intercolonial matches would be played on the Melbourne ground but he did not see that they had any right to suppose anything of the sort. Intercolonial matches were now managed by an association, and that association was a good deal bound with other clubs, who might offer lower terms than the Melbourne Club, and which might therefore be accepted. With reference to the international matches they did not at the present time know what international team was coming to this colony. He might, however, say, as a representative of the East Melbourne Club, that he had that day closed with a team of All-England cricketers, and that if they come to the colony, the whole of their matches would be played on the East Melbourne ground. (A voice - "What team is it?"). He declined to say. (Here interruptions became somewhat frequent, and the chairman had to insist upon order being observed).²

The contents of this speech were a direct challenge to the primacy of the Melbourne CC. That the challenge was thrown down by a man who was one of the most powerful cricket administrators in the colony at this time was significant. H.H.Budd, was the son of a noted colonial civil servant, Richard Hale Budd,³ and came from a family

1 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 30 May 1876.

2 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 30 May 1876 Note: this meeting was reported in both *The Age* and *Argus* of 31 May.

3 R.H.Budd was educated at Rugby and St. John's College Cambridge (going to St. John's seems to have become traditional in the Budd family prior to emigration). He was a rowing blue who emigrated to the Port Phillip district in 1840. Initially he was a sheep farmer. He seems to have been unsuccessful in this occupation and he emigrated to Van Diemen's Land, where he set up a school. Returning to Melbourne in 1846 he was the Headmaster of the Diocesan Grammar School which shortly after changed its name to the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School. When he retired

which had seen at least three generations educated at Cambridge. H.H. was, in fact, from a very similar background to many of the Melbourne CC committee. He was educated at the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School and was now a solicitor of some note. His ambition appeared to be to build the East Melbourne CC up as the principal cricket club in the colony, in both cricketing and social terms. As secretary of both the East Melbourne and the VCA he attempted to fulfil that ambition and he was able to launch a two-pronged attack on the Melbourne's pretensions and status. The main thrust of this attack was the supplanting of the MCG as the place where big cricket was played. What appears to have happened in this particular instance was that John Conway, acting as agent for Lillywhite's XI, had entered into negotiations with the East Melbourne, negotiations that at this time were nearing completion. An international tour would have given Budd's club cachet and finance. It would have shifted the centre of gravity of Victorian cricket away from the Melbourne CC to the newer club, situated in nearby Jolimont. But perhaps the most sinister of Budd's threats was that this coup would be, in part, the work of the VCA, which would take the lowest terms offered to it by any ground for intercolonial matches. As secretary of that body he was in an ideal position to negotiate with himself. Despite this, on this occasion the Melbourne CC was able to forestall these plans and persuade Conway that the games should be played on the more historic MCG.

The Melbourne CC had undoubtedly been experiencing a troublesome period when Budd made his threats. The expense of running the Association had been large and in playing terms the club was enjoying a lean time. The East Melbourne, on the other hand, was in the ascendant and was justified in seeing itself as the successor to the older club's laurels. The East Melbourne had been founded in 1857, by some of the first pupils of Scotch College - Tom and Charles Dwight, J.O. and Frederick Moody. Initially called the Abbotsford CC, these Scotch Collegians were soon joined by friends from school, making the club representative of Melbourne's urban professional bourgeoisie, with its social tone set by the high proportion of members who had either attended Scotch or the Grammar School. As was the wont of such clubs at this time, they drew up a petition to persuade the government to grant them land for a cricket ground. In this they had been explicitly encouraged by the Hon. W.C.Haines, who was one of the most prominent politicians of this time in Victoria. Haines was a great lover of cricket and was prepared to promote the game through government patronage

from this he went into the Education Department where he became a noted administrator. He married a daughter of leading Victorian lawyer J.L.Purves, who was the tutor of Melbourne CC committee member E.F.Mitchell. The personal history of R.H.Budd demonstrates the class position of his son, who was undoubtedly placed high in the élite. It shows that he was from a remarkably similar background to many on the Melbourne CC committee. See *A.D.B.*, Vol.3, pp.290-1.

and this policy should be regarded as direct political encouragement of the game. The petition itself contained the names of many prominent young Melbourne gentlemen, including William Clarke, T.F.Wray, H.C.A.Harrison and J.S.Youngusband, all of whom were involved in the Melbourne CC.¹ The club very soon established itself at the forefront of cricket, with early presidents of the club including Haines, W.A.K.Plummer and W.Hammill.² By 1874-75 H.J.Henty, a member of the great squatting family, was ensconced as president, while Daniel Wilkie had served as vice-president and C.Forrester as secretary.³ The linkages between the two clubs were blatant and both could claim a socially prestigious membership.

However, it was in 1875, with the advent of Budd as secretary, that the problems between the two clubs really commenced. By 1876 Budd was able to claim at the East Melbourne A.G.M. that it had attained 'the position of the leading club of the colony'.⁴ There was not a little truth in this, not least because the membership of the East Melbourne had reached a figure of over 600 and had thus surpassed the Melbourne CC.⁵ Budd and the East Melbourne CC continued to challenge the senior club for many years. The remainder of the 1870s saw disputes over cup matches, which all too often were abandoned,⁶ and a challenge to the MCG posed by the rapidly improving Jolimont ground. Despite the East Melbourne's attempt to host Lillywhite's XI in 1877 being forestalled, they continued to pose a threat, especially as they became the regular hosts of the intercolonial match with South Australia from 1877. Meanwhile, on another front, in 1879 there was a reconstitution of the VCA, and Budd, in his capacity as secretary of the Association imposed upon the Melbourne CC such a high price for

1 A.E.Clarke,*The East Melbourne Cricket Club. Its History, 1860-1910*, (George Robertson, Melbourne 1910), pp.1-3. The petition is an interesting document of social history for Melbourne at this time and demonstrates the links between different cricket clubs and the fact that cricket was an important part of the lives of the developing urban bourgeoisie.

2 Both of whom were politicians and both of whom served upon the Melbourne CC Committee.

3 Both Wilkie and Forrester served on the Melbourne CC committee.

4 *Argus*, (4 Sept. 1876), p.3.

5 Conway was able to write in his 1877 annual that it was now 'one of the leading clubs in Australia, not only in cricketing ability, but also by the position it holds in regard to members, there being now over 600 names in the books, which is more than many clubs this side of the line can say'. J.Conway,*Conway's Australian Cricketers' Annual for 1876-77*, (F.F.Baillère, Melbourne 1877), p.42. The reason he put for this expansion was H.H.Budd.

6 *Minutes of the A.G.M.*, 7 Sept. 1878. The Melbourne CC committee reported 'that cup matches were beginning to exercise an unhealthy effect upon cricket, owing to the club jealousies that they have brought into existence'. In fact, for some of this period the fixture between the two clubs was suspended. At the beginning of the 1876-77 season it proved impossible for the club to arrange a match in the cup competition with the East Melbourne. In this case the stumbling block definitely appeared to be Budd, as he unconvincingly explained that the club's fixture list was full (*Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 2 Oct. 1876), and that the East Melbourne had adopted their normal course in arranging matches (*Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 Oct. 1876).

entry that the club nearly did not join. But as they realised, if they wanted to be part of the forum they had to pay a price and thus they capitulated.

Competition between the two clubs over the playing of matches on their grounds led the Melbourne CC into reducing their terms for the hire of the MCG. This prompted the rueful remark from the committee to the club that 'owing to competition the committee were compelled to grant the ground and the grandstand on exceptionally low terms'. Their reasoning for this action was clear from the statement following, which said that their sole motivation had been 'to secure these matches' and by inference keep big cricket matches within the confines of the MCG.¹ In 1886 one of the more serious cases of ground competition nearly led to the advent of two English touring teams visiting the antipodes.² In that year the club had already sponsored an Australian XI to England, but at the same time they were toying with the idea of bringing out an England XI. However, a professional/entrepreneurial venture was also being planned by Alfred Shaw and James Lillywhite and was being organised by John Conway from Sydney. Conway had come to an agreement with the East Melbourne for games to be played on their ground. Wardill in England had also recruited a team, while the committee of the Melbourne CC had instructed him to attempt to forestall Shaw, by promising him patronage in a future season. On 12 August the club held a special committee meeting following the reception of a cable from Wardill that announced the composition of his team. At the same meeting it was announced that the Shaw/Lillywhite venture had engaged the East Melbourne ground. The committee decided that if it could prise the professional XI away from Jolimont it would postpone the tour it was planning on sponsoring and they therefore cabled an offer to Shaw. They fully intended to cancel their proposed tour if Shaw accepted while on a meeting the following day they decided that if Shaw turned down their offer they would engage an eleven themselves.³ The following day, John Conway, acting as principal agent for Shaw, cancelled the agreement with the East Melbourne and engaged the MCG. Immediately they telegraphed a resounding 'no' to Wardill and a financial disaster for all parties was averted until the following year when the stakes that were being played for revolved around intercolonial rivalries.⁴

1 *Minutes of A.G.M.*, 4 Sept. 1880. In 1877 they had been charging a rate of 12.5 % on the gross proceeds of the match. By the season of 1879-80 this rate had been reduced to 10%. The following year the charge was further lessened to 5% on the gross takings of the ground and 25% on the gross takings of the stand. Source for all figures, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*.

2 This anticipated events that were to occur the following year when a Melbourne CC backed Gentlemen's XI toured in opposition to a Sydney backed professional team.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 & 13 Aug. 1886.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Aug. 1886.

So what does this tell us about the relationship between the Melbourne CC and other bodies in Victorian cricket? At first the battle for control seems to be rooted in finance. Indeed, when in 1887 the club agreed to grant the entire ground completely free to the VCA the latter appeared to be in a very strong financial bargaining position, as for some time they had been looking for a site to build their own ground. But in reality, with rising property prices (the result of the remarkable boom that created 'Marvellous Melbourne') they had been hampered in their task. Their only option was to build a ground completely away from the centre of the city. At the same time the club itself had entered its golden age when the tours to Australia that it organised started to become extremely lucrative thus causing vast increases in their bank balance, as well as the indirect boosting of membership which was a spin-off of the continuance of big cricket being played upon the MCG. With its prestigious pavilion, its well appointed ground, its control of the 1886 Australian XI and even its history, the club could afford to grant the ground free. It was a generous, even munificent offer, which strikes the present day observer as an act of patronage rather than one that they were forced into.¹

Despite the threat that had been posed by the East Melbourne club and the VCA, the Melbourne CC had survived and flourished and achieved a position of hegemony within Victorian cricket by the end of the 1880s. As far back as the early part of that decade there had been suggestions that the Association was impotent in the face of the club. A dispute had occurred in 1883 over a cup match with the South Melbourne CC. The result was that the Melbourne CC refused to play the fixture and then more or less refused to abide by the decision of the Association over the matter. At a further meeting the VCA decided to rule the cup committee at fault. *The Age* correspondent accused the Melbourne CC committee of 'showing the white feather' in refusing to play South Melbourne, but concluded that

the meeting clearly showed that when in collision with the Melbourne Club the Association has to succumb, and that the members are better fitted to discuss questions of legal interpretation than to protect and advance the true interests of the game.²

The Melbourne CC was convinced of its power in being able to stand up to the VCA. Thus, in 1888, the club was quite prepared to hijack the functions of the Association when the VCA and the New South Wales Cricket Association (NSWCA) were at loggerheads over the continuation of the cricket fixture between the two colonies. An impasse had been reached and it appears that the initiative to overthrow the VCA had come from the NSWCA itself. The club met a representative of the NSWCA

¹ See *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Dec. 1887 - report from *The Argus* of that date pasted in.

² *Age*, (19 Nov. 1883), p.6.

in December and then decided that it would run the game itself.¹ This resulted in the VCA calling a boycott of the club.² At the A.G.M. of the club the committee summed up its reasons for acting in what was regarded^{as} an imperious manner:

That it was in opposition to the wishes of that body [VCA] they do not deny, but they felt, and still contend, that they acted purely in the interests of the game they are appointed to foster, and so long as they can point to this as their sole rule of action they are amply sustained under any...accusation.³

Subsequently the VCA made up with the Melbourne CC. The dispute itself revealed the complications that surround inter- and intra-colonial cricket, with groups prepared to ally themselves with others who could act for their benefit. But it also demonstrates the power of the Melbourne CC. One has to ask, what other club would have been capable of taking over the supposedly all-powerful Association? At the same time one has to consider why the NSWCA approached the Melbourne CC over all the other clubs. The simple answer is that the club was a powerful opponent of the vested interests within the VCA.

Furthermore, this tells us something deeper about Victorian cricket itself. Theories about conflict in sport often revolve around a class conflict. But this was patently not class conflict in the usual terms, but a conflict over who had the right to control cricket. At a deeper level it was also about which of a number of different groups from a similar class-background had the right to possess and control the ideological assumptions that cricket itself contained. Budd, for example, was part of the dominant class. He may or may not have been regarded as one of the élite, but nevertheless he was an urban professional from a well established bourgeois background. In class terms he was allied with the membership of the Melbourne CC. And yet he was in open conflict with them, because he and his club wanted to be the top dog. This cannot be solely explained in terms of a desire for power within an 'autonomous' sphere called 'cricket'. Budd would have been known in society at large as a cricket administrator. Part of his standing within the bourgeois society of Melbourne would have been based upon this. At the same time, he must have subscribed to the theory that he and his allies were upholding the 'spirit of sport' just as well as any committee member of the Melbourne CC. So what we have is intra-class

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 3 Dec. 1888.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 10 Jan. 1889. A measure that was voted for by the margin of 23 to 6 (of whom 3 would have been Melbourne CC delegates themselves).

3 *Minutes of the A.G.M.*, 14 Sept. 1889.

conflict about a climb up the ladder of preferment based upon who had the right to possess and control the ideology of cricket.

The VCA remained, for the duration of this period, a thorn in the flesh of the Melbourne CC. During the 1890s it formed an alliance with the NSWCA, against the interests of the Melbourne CC, the players and the SCG Trustees. This alliance was solidified in the shape of the Australasian Cricket Council (ACC), which although a weak body provided the forerunner of the Board of Control. But for most of the 90s the VCA remained firmly in the shade of the Melbourne CC and it became so impoverished that by the beginning of the twentieth century there was talk of the Melbourne CC taking over its functions.¹ In March 1901 certain sections of the VCA actually approached the club with this end in mind, to the delight of 'Mid-On' in *The Leader*.² On the 15 March, this delegation met with the committee of the club. It consisted of J.T.Liscombe (St.Kilda CC), F.Laver (East Melbourne) and P.Knuckey (Fitzroy), of whom the last two had actually voted against approaching the club. Consequently, according to the *Minutes*, they 'made a statement each conflicting with the other'.³ Not surprisingly, from this typical malaise, which reveals the divisions within cricket in Victoria, nothing occurred. The VCA remained impoverished but in nominal control of cricket, while the Melbourne CC remained the masters. Nevertheless, only a few years later the VCA would launch an assault on the Melbourne CC that would destroy this mastership.

II

Opposition and Allies at the National and International Level

The view from Sydney

Events in Melbourne were mirrored, to an extent, in Sydney. Between 1860 and the end of the 1880s there existed two distinct parties with two distinct attitudes to the control of cricket. Thus intra-colonial rivalries led to inter-colonial alliances with bodies outside of New South Wales. Sydney itself had no direct equivalent to the Melbourne

1 Not only the VCA but several of its constituent clubs were in dire financial straits. The Melbourne CC had helped these clubs out individually, donating to them the grand total of £800 from the huge profits that were made from running A.C.Maclaren's England tour in 1901. The club had also loaned the East Melbourne £300 free of interest, see *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 Feb. 1901.

2 H.W.Hedley, who wrote under the pseudonym of 'Mid-On', was a vociferous supporter of the Melbourne CC. Writing about this prospect he said 'I have always maintained that an influential, enterprising and perfectly independent body like the Melbourne Cricket Club would be sure to manage the game in this state more satisfactorily than an unwieldy association, which has been a pronounced failure. Every man of common sense must realise that the Melbourne club stands by itself in quite a different position to any of the others'. *Leader*, (16 March 1901), p.17.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 15 March 1901.

CC, as no one organisation had achieved pre-eminence over another. During the 1850s and 60s the Albert CC had looked like emulating the Melbourne CC, but any pretensions it had to such a position were undermined by the control that was exercised over its ground by the Albert Cricket Ground Company, who continued to run the ground after the club's collapse. This put the company in a commanding position as they possessed the best facilities in the city. They were able to charge the NSWCA a huge 30% on takings from the proceeds of games. It is therefore not surprising that the Association leapt at the chance to create their own ground when land was made available by the government for that very purpose. This intervention was undoubtedly due to the influence of Richard Driver, one of the chief administrators on the NSWCA, who also happened to be Minister of Lands at that particular time.¹ And so the Association Cricket Ground was built.

Under normal circumstances this should have given the NSWCA absolute control of cricket in the state, for they now possessed the resource of a ground, as well as facing no opposition from any over-mighty cricket club. However, when the ground was opened it was vested in trustees and Driver decided, in his position as one of the chief members of the trust, that it was not in his interests to govern the ground for the benefit of the Association, but that he had to control it for the government and public. For years this caused serious problems between the trustees and the Association: the trustees claiming that they had the right to decide how and for what the ground was used while the Association stood by, impotent in the face of this.² It was not until 1904 that a court judgement was given stating that the NSWCA had full control of the ground that was built for their benefit.³

1 Driver is a fairly typical character, in that he was an urban professional, a solicitor who had also been a politician for many years.

2 A typical example of this occurred when the Trust decided in 1894 to change the name of the ground from the 'Association' to the 'Sydney'. The implication of this was that the ground had no connection with the Association for whom it had been built. The members of the NSWCA were upset by this action, with Victor Cohen, the treasurer of the Association, claiming that the trustees had always been against them. The material evidence for this was clear. Apart from anything else the trustees had founded a club in 1888 to be attached to the ground for the purpose of giving people the opportunity of being a member of the SCG. This club operated totally outside the jurisdiction of the NSWCA and the money that was derived from it went straight to the trustees. Thus Cohen accused them of attempting to deprive the Association of rights to the ground and handing them over to the Sydney Club in the same way that the Melbourne CC controlled the MCG. See, J.Pollard, *The Turbulent Years of Australian Cricket*, (Angus and Robertson, London 1988), p.19; P.Derriman, *True to the Blue*, (NSWCA, Sydney 1987), *im passim*, which gives a more detailed account of the disputes.

3 The ground had had problems from the day of its opening, when the top players had boycotted the inaugural match in favour of playing for the Australian XI while the Albert Ground Cricket Company was challenging the right of the Association to charge admission fees for entrance to the new ground.

Meanwhile, until the end of the 1880s there remained intense rivalries between Victoria and New South Wales that were commonly exacerbated by events on and off the field.¹ The ultimate example of this occurred with the twin tours of 1887-88, with the Melbourne CC backing its own predominantly amateur team with the full support of the VCA, while the SCG Trustees and the NSWCA cast aside their animosities and threw their combined weight behind Shaw and Shrewsbury's XI.² The dispute over the two tours was part of a larger intercolonial rivalry between the two colonies which involved a range of social and political issues including protectionism and colonial boundaries.³ Cricket was yet another of these issues, indeed an issue in its own right, and the disputes that dogged it were intensified by the existence of rival organisations that were prepared to resolve their differences through actions leading to financial ruin.⁴ Nevertheless, it was possible for trans-Murray rivalries to be submerged in conflicts that occurred within each colony itself. During the 1890s these types of alliances solidified as each group found that it shared more with an organisation in the other colony than with its near organisational neighbours. Thus the Melbourne CC united with the SCG Trust to bring British teams to Australia and rake in the profits for themselves, while the Associations united within the ACC to attempt to forestall what they perceived as the greed of players and tour organisers.

1 There were a plethora of disputes in the 1860s. These followed with frequency over the next few years. A typical instance of the problems that existed in the relationship between the two colonies can be seen in the issue of selection of 'combined' Australian teams. For example, in 1884, the NSWCA chose 10 from that colony for a supposed combined team to face a touring Australian XI. Montefiore *"Cricket in the Doldrums"*, p. 40. In another instance, in 1886, the NSWCA refused to sanction the Melbourne CC's Australian XI team, displaying open hostility to the initiative of the Melbourne CC and refusing to participate in the preliminary games played before the team set-out for Britain.

2 See above, chapter 6, for further details about this incident.

3 Victoria had been very protective of its position and had blocked attempts by NSW to form a federal convention at the beginning of the 1880s. Gradually there was some rapprochement, but it was a slow and painful process. Many things stood in the way, including Victoria's insistence on protectionism. The battle for the Riverina was another key issue. The Riverina district was predominantly settled by Victorians and from Melbourne's point of view control of the Riverina meant more business done in the city, as well as greater status and prosperity for the colony. But the boundaries were disputed and such things as freight stock taxes were introduced when the free-boarder agreements broke down in the early 1870s. See Serle, *Rush to be Rich*, pp.190-9. The spirit of antagonism was a marked feature of attempts to institute a Federal Convention and Council during the late 1880s. Obviously this was not ultimately detrimental to Australian federation but it did delay it. Also see Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*, pp.29-32. For a more detailed account of the solving of problems and the framing of the constitution see R.Norris, *The Emergent Commonwealth. Australian Federation: Expectations and Fulfilment 1889-1910*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1975), and A.W.Martin, *Essays in Australian Federation*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1969).

4 The 1887-88 twin tour episode was a classic example of this.

The Australian XI was one of the more peculiar phenomena of Australian cricket. It was an independent organisation which was more or less player sponsored and controlled. Founded in the late 1870s the XI was initially criticised by many of those who had some control of the game, specifically for their attempts to maximise profits, as well as to compete competitively on the cricket field. Among the critics of this venture was the Melbourne CC itself. Nevertheless, the team managed to survive through the 90s and right into the new century with the help and support of the Melbourne CC which had changed its opinion of the XI by the early 1890s.¹

The Australian XI was founded in 1877 by John Conway. Conway had already had direct experience of cricket entrepreneurialism as agent for Lillywhite's team in 1876-77, and it may have been this experience that opened his eyes to the financial potential of such a venture. However, there was an enormous difference between the organisation of the English teams and that of the Australians, most notable of which was that the team was financed as a joint-stock company. Therefore, all the players, bar the Bannerman brothers who opted to receive a fixed sum, put a share of £50 into the company and then extracted an equal dividend from the profits. There was also a fairly large gap in social origins between the English and Australian teams. Whereas most of the Englishmen were from a working-class or artisan background,² the Australians tended to be white-collar workers or lower professionals. Thus, as can be seen, there

1 Montefiore, "*Cricket in the Doldrums*", is particularly interesting on the Australian XI and his work has been invaluable for this particular section. He has asserted that the XI was of the same type as the entrepreneurial teams that toured England in the years between 1840 and 1880 (p.24) and that also came to the colonies to spread the gospel of cricket. He described the XI as 'spectator orientated, economically pragmatic and...[recognising] the potential to unite colonial cricket's fragmented popularity successfully in the international arena'. This was in opposition to another faction which subscribed 'to the largely pre-modern value system and economic priorities of the English game, and whose interrelationships were defined by a history of parochialism and internecine power struggles' (pp.i-iv). What he means by this was an amateur ideal promoted by the cricket associations and the Melbourne CC clashed with the entrepreneurial, pragmatic attitudes of the Australian XI. In the formation of the XI and the organisational clashes between different interest groups, Montefiore sees an action replay of 'the call to arrest player control of the game' which had occurred in Britain when the professional XIs had been crushed (p.10). Added to this, the Australian XI 'became both a commodity in an initially receptive market place and the vehicle for acting out a serious national and (as some would emphasise) imperial purpose' (p.24). Eventually, he sees a victory of the 'middle class moralists' over the entrepreneurial spirits of the XI in the 1890s with the formation of the Australasian Cricket Council (p.88). However, it is possible to assert that the Australian XI was not a simple reproduction of an English model and that while the XI did suffer criticism from the Melbourne CC during the 1880s, by the 1890s the club was an ardent supporter of the team, a feeling that was often reciprocated.

2 For occupational background of English professional cricketers see Mandle, 'The Professional Cricketer in England in the Nineteenth Century', p.4.

were specific differences in social and economic composition between the cricket teams of the two countries.

The aim of the Australian XI was to maximise profits, as well as to play cricket. At the same time their campaign was regarded from within the XI, and also by the press, as an exercise in public relations for Australia. Thus, Conway was able to comment on the phenomenal success of the team's first tour to Britain in these terms:

By its performances in the colonies, in Great Britain and America, and, still more, by the gentlemanly bearing and good conduct of its members, [the team] has done more to create an interest in, and promote a knowledge of these colonies, wherever they have gone, than all the Agents-General that have ever been sent home, and have made Australian cricket celebrated wherever the English tongue is spoken. Our friends in the old country will say that the land that can produce such men as...those who form this eleven, must be a place where the Anglo-Saxon thrives, and we may expect that, in future, Australia, instead of being...a *terra incognita*, will become better known and better appreciated.¹

This mixture of Anglo-Saxon pride and Australian national destiny masked the £700-£800 each of ^{which} the members of the team received. It also hid the £1200 that was Conway's share of the venture.² Nevertheless, the same attitude was expressed in other accounts of the tour, as well as in the press, even before the team had left Australia's shores.³

Unfortunately for the endeavours of future Australian XIs, the subsequent history of the teams during the 1880s was interpreted by many contemporary observers as being a tale of money-grubbing greed and a general desire to maximise profits through the total exploitation of cricket. The problems started in England, where certain cricketers began to suspect the Australians of not being true amateurs, under which social category they were playing. The problem was compounded by the virtual boycott of the 1880 XI, which was a direct result of Lord Harris's influence after the 'riot' of 1879 at Sydney. Looking at these ventures during the early 1880s several English observers commented on the similarities between the Australian XIs and the old professional teams, hinting that the former too were both out-and-out professionals.⁴

1 Conway, *Conway's Australian Cricketers' Annual*, 1877-78, p.6.

2 Montefiore, "Cricket in the Doldrums", p.28.

3 See in particular the account of the tour by 'Argus' (P.E.Reynold), *The Australian Cricketers' Tour through Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain*, p.1. For press enthusiasm before the tour see the comments of *The Australasian*, (29 Dec. 1877), quoted in Montefiore, "Cricket in the Doldrums", p.44: 'If the Australians make their expenses they will be satisfied, and if they get something to the good, and we hope they will, they will be agreeably surprised. They are actuated by higher motives....'

4 C.F.Pardon said 'they seemed to be throwing us back on past times, when All-England and the United South Elevens did little more than play a programme of inferior interest', while Lillywhite's

Indeed, both amateur and professional cricketers in England were concerned about the way in which the Australian XIs blatantly made money and kept amateur status. Alfred Shaw was a good example of this, especially when he commented upon his own team's tour of Australia in 1884-85, a tour that was marred by members of the Australian XI refusing to play the team following a dispute in England where some of the Nottinghamshire professionals had struck to obtain higher payments before a match against the Australian XI:

We challenged the Australians to play two games at Melbourne and Sydney. Mr. Murdoch's team asked for half the proceeds of the matches. Such a demand coming from a team supposed to be amateurs, and playing at home staggered us.¹

The 1884-85 dispute saw the biggest debate to date in Australia about the nature of the XI. In 1884, when they toured England, their attitude had so riled both Lord's and the Oval that they were prepared to prevent the coming of another Australia XI, and may have led to the 1886 team being organised and led by the Melbourne CC.² When the 1885 dispute occurred the reaction all over Australia was virulent. *Wisden* commented that the unpatriotic conduct of Murdoch and his men 'was severely condemned',³ while, the Hon. C.C.Kingston, the Attorney-General of South Australia said that the XI had sunk 'everything for monetary considerations';

commented that 'if the Australians did not make cricket their profession in their native land, they most decidedly did when they came to this country'. Lord Harris's eagle eye also noted that the Australians behaved like professionals and professed himself worried about the possible development of a semi-professional rank, which, needless to say, he was not in favour of. C.F.Pardon, *The Australians in England. A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1882*, (Bell's Life in London, London 1882), p.175; n.a., *John Lillywhite's Cricket Companion for 1881*, (Lillywhite's, London 1881), p.39; Lord Harris, 'Development of Cricket', *National Review*, Vol.2 (1883-84).

1 Shaw, Pullin, *Alfred Shaw*, p.83. Shaw was a lot less philosophical at the time of the dispute, when he said 'the real cause of all this disturbance was money nothing but money'. See Anon., *Shaw and Shrewsbury's Team in Australia 1884-85*, (Shaw and Shrewsbury, Nottingham 1885), p.25. It seems very likely that the dispute was a direct result of the strike action taken by the Notts Professionals in England. However, Montefiore has suggested another reason for this action was that the Australian XI had realised its 'private worth was considerably enhanced by limiting and regulating their exposure to a paying public inundated by first class cricket'. Montefiore, *"Cricket in the Doldrums"*, p.69. This point is extremely hard to prove or disprove, but may contain some truth. However, if this was what the XI intended the ruse may well have backfired as the events of the early 80s seemed to make the team less welcome at 'Home'. It also appears that personal reasons may have played some part in the dispute and one might perhaps take seriously Murdoch's claim that the refusal of the XI to play Shaw's team was because Conway was manager; see Anon., *Shaw and Shrewsbury's Team in Australia*, p.24. Shaw disparaged this attitude but knowing Conway's record in cricket, as well as his relationship with the Melbourne CC, there may at least be a grain of truth in this.

2 Montefiore, *"Cricket in the Doldrums"*, p.77.

3 *Wisden's Cricketer's Almanack*, (1886), p.18.

If the cricketing public of Australia were to allow the game to be sacrificed for money it would be a national calamity...(Applause)...He would not have referred to this matter, but as an earnest supporter and upholder of manly sports he considered [sic.] his duty, in common with others, to protest against cricket being reduced to a mere money-making matter.¹

The Melbourne CC itself had been less than happy about the activities of the Australian XI from its formation, especially about the amount of money that the players were taking and their persistent demand for a high proportion of the gate-money taken at matches involving the MCG. This was mostly the case when the club had brought out the visiting English team. In the case of Harris's tour of 1879 the committee actually blamed the XI for the loss that the club incurred on the tour.² Following the Melbourne CC sponsored tour of Ivo Bligh, A.F. Robinson, a committee member of the Melbourne CC, wrote a letter to many of the leading colonial papers under the pseudonym of 'XYZ' which criticised the Australian XI for demanding 50% of the gate in matches on the MCG. In advocating the restriction of Australian XI fixtures entirely to England, while complaining about the money-making enterprises of the team, he was undoubtedly expressing the majority opinion of the committee.³ This, then, provided added incentive for the club to attempt to run the XI.

There was a backlash to the XI in Australia, which mirrored the attitude of many administrators at 'home'. But from the team's point of view there was no hypocrisy involved in playing as amateurs and yet reaping handsome rewards from the game. They had realised the class-based reality of the amateur-professional dichotomy from their first visit to the Mother Country. They appear to have been naïvely shocked at their first meeting with the Gentlemen's XI, particularly as a result of the demands for a payment of £60 by W.G. Grace, his brother G.F. and W. Gilbert. The Australians labelled the team 'the so-called Gentlemen' and the correspondent covering the tour stated that 'it was manifestly unfair that such men should be included in an amateur and Gentlemen team'.⁴ Consequently, it does not seem strange that men like Murdoch were prepared to milk the system for all that it was worth. Technically the Australian XI could claim to be amateurs. It seems that the English categorically misunderstood the way in which the eleven was financed. The idea of a cricketing joint-stock company had no real equivalent in English cricketing terms. The fact remained that the use of the share system entitled each man to claim a portion of the profits. It also seems that many

¹ *Wisden's Cricketer's Almanack*, (1886), p.18.

² *Minutes of the A.G.M.*, Sept. 1879.

³ Montefiore, "Cricket in the Doldrums", p.64.

⁴ 'Argus', *The Australian Cricketers' Tour through Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain*, p.41.

of the commentators in Australia misunderstood the class issues as well. They thought it was the making of money that made a man a professional cricketer at 'Home', not the class position of that person. In the early 1880s, only *The Bulletin* seems to have understood what were the real issues, when writing in 1884:

We don't object to our men being regarded as professionals; but we do strongly object...that the Australian, merely because he gets paid for an accomplishment he happens to possess, must grovel and lose his self-respect, and abuse and prostrate himself before every creature who puts an eye-glass in his head to magnify his brains and wears white "spats" to make his feet look small.¹

The real issue of class position was masked by talk of money. The major complaint about Australian XIs in England was not that of speculation, but that the men who were claiming amateur status were in fact not entitled to it due to their lowly class position, or so the English thought. This must have been, at least in part, a result of general attitudes to colonial society, but there was also a grain of truth in it. The class position of the teams ranged from the bourgeois solicitor Murdoch to the postman Giffen. No wonder confusion led English journalists in the 1890s to describe the personalities of the members of the teams in the patronizingly personal manner that was reserved for professionals and not amateurs.² But, in reality, what members of the XI wanted to be treated as was members of the bourgeoisie. They felt that their talents were no less than those of the top 'shamateurs' and neither was their location in the class structure. At the very least many, if not most, of the members of the XI were aspirant bourgeois, using cricket as a tool of financial and social advancement. Many of the other members of the team were properly bourgeois and needed no such advancement. But more important than this is the fact that by behaving like many of the English amateurs they were effectively claiming the same status.

Because the 1886 tour was controlled by the Melbourne CC it met with far more approval than the previous Australian teams in the 1880s. The tour itself was not a financial or playing success, partially due to the absence of such players as Murdoch, McDonnell, Massie, Horan and Boyle, all of whom opted out for business or professional reasons.³ Nevertheless, the tour was regarded in Britain as somehow more legitimate than previous ventures, as stated by *Lillywhite's Cricketers Annual* of 1887:

¹ Quoted in Montefiore, "*Cricket in the Doldrums*", p.74.

² For example *Cricket Chat: Gleamings from "Cricket" during 1883-84*, (Cricket Office, London 1884), p.64, describes E.Evans, an Australian cricketer, as having 'unassuming manners'. They would certainly never have described a 'gentleman' in this way as a 'gentleman's' manners were unquestionable.

³ Although the fact that the tour went on a strictly amateur basis may have had something to do with the absence of some of these players.

the visit was invested with additional importance and it certainly appealed more forcibly to the sympathy of English cricketers, from the fact that it was made under the auspices and management of a body which had identified itself actively and closely with the cricket of the old country.¹

This view was to be echoed at a later date when Hawke was interviewed in the early 1890s by the *Cricket Field*:

What I do most strongly object to is that one or two men should "run" the thing as a commercial speculation and spoil our cricket. If the teams are coming over for the one object of making money, I maintain that they are not wanted. But if the Melbourne CC, for instance, will send over men whose object it is to play the game, without consideration of how much money it will bring them, then by all means let us welcome such a team. It is one thing to pay an amateur's legitimate expenses, it is another to put money in his pocket. Only a day or two ago I was talking to a prominent Australian gentleman, he said he felt very strongly on the subject, himself, and disliked the idea of speculation intensely - as did all his friends...I like Australians and Australia, but I do not like speculation.²

It was beyond Hawke to realise that the Australian teams were not speculations in the same sense that the English professional teams were. He did not comprehend that if the team lost money, then it was everyone's loss. No-one would receive a penny, indeed all would be bound to pay any debts or liabilities that arose. Thus it was the team's risk, and not that of one man.³

The Australian XI, with its joint-stock organisation, was dealt a severe blow by the events of 1884 and 1885. It was not, however, mortal. The team, after enjoying a few years of mediocrity, reasserted itself with strength and vigour in the 1890s. At this time it was backed by the Melbourne CC, who were prepared to advance money to them to aid them with their venture. On the face of it this is paradoxical. Nothing about the organisation of the teams had changed since the club had been a severe critic of its operations in the 1880s. But, in reality both parties needed each other. For one thing the cricketers' gained prestige from being supported and sanctioned by Australia's leading club, while the club gained the recognition and support of the top cricketers. Secondly, the club itself would by now have been aware of the workings of

1 *Lillywhite's Cricketers Annual*, 1887, p.18.

2 *Cricket Field*, Vol. 1, 11 June 1892, p.92.

3 Pollard, *The Turbulent Years*, pp.318-20. This is a reproduction of the Players' Agreement of 1884. See in Particular Clauses vii, xii, xix. There was an option that was occasionally taken of being paid a fixed sum, presumably for those who could not afford a share. Taking this option meant sailing much closer to the wind of professionalism.

'shamateurism' through its own experiences with the teams they had brought out or supported from Britain and they were prepared to tolerate the money-making activities of the Australians for the reason that they subscribed to the same hypocrisies as the English authorities. Thirdly, it has to be said that the English authorities themselves did little to stop the entrepreneurialism of the Australians, bar grumbling about them. They too may have realised that by making complaints about the Australians they might have been forced to put their own house in order.¹ Fourthly, with the antagonism of the Associations, and in particular the ACC, it was an ideal partnership, which must have been sealed by the players in the XI who also played for the Melbourne CC during this period. These included Blackham, William Bruce and Hugh Trumble. What in the 1880s had been two mutually antagonistic groups had by the 1890s become two inter-linked allies whose interests were broadly similar.

The Australasian Cricket Council (ACC)

The 1890s started with 'cricket in the doldrums' and ended with cricket enjoying a boom. Despite the fierce depression in Australia, and particularly in Victoria, the structure of cricket survived, which was no thanks to all ^{the} protagonists involved. Public interest in the game was revived, in part, by the tour that was privately sponsored by the diffident and eccentric aristocrat, Lord Sheffield, who brought a team to the antipodes captained by the now gargantuan W.G. Grace.² Sheffield left, as his testimony to the hospitality of the colonies, a sum of money to create a prize to be awarded each season to the most successful colony in intercolonial cricket. Meanwhile in the political arena there was talk of federation in the air. Since the late 1880s an ineffective forum, in the form of the Federal Council, existed to attempt to facilitate easier relations between the antagonistic colonies. This was not an overwhelming success, with New South Wales, in particular, suspicious of and stand-offish towards Victoria's enthusiasm for protection. A Federal Convention had gone some way to resolving these difficulties in 1891 but, for New South Wales, Victoria with its insistence on protection remained the 'Lion in the way' to federation.³

1 Laver, *An Australian Cricketer on Tour*, p.157. Even at the beginning of the Board of Control dispute in 1905 the Marylebone CC were prepared to say to the members of the Australian XI that they 'would welcome visits of Australian cricket teams to England, under the same conditions as have existed in the past, if the teams were representative of Australian cricket', which suggests tacit acceptance by the club for the financial arrangements of the team and their amateur status. If this appears paradoxical, it must be remembered that during this period they were unable or unwilling to clamp down on the shamateur activities of the English Amateurs.

2 The Grand Old Man of cricket charged expenses every bit as ample as his frame to the tune of £3000.

3 This quotation was made by Victorian premier James Service, an ardent federationist, in 1890, *A.D.B.*, Vol.6, p.110.

Both of these two aspects were relevant to Australian cricket in the 1890s. The Sheffield donation bequeathed the Sheffield Shield, and was one of the primary stimuli to the creation of the ACC, while talks of political federation provided a climate for the formation of the Council, with its mood favouring a unified Australia.¹ Like the politicians, the cricket administrators sought to centralise the organisation of Australian cricket.² But there was a secondary, and perhaps more obvious, motive for this move and that was to control the perceived excesses of the players, and of the Melbourne CC. This resulted in a polarisation between two distinct groups, which ended in the short-lived domination of the players, the Melbourne CC and the SCG Trust, over the Associations and the Associations-backed ACC.

The Council was actually formed in September 1892 following the meeting of delegates from the three major cricketing colonies: New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. Queensland and Tasmania were represented by proxies. The impetus towards the formation of the new body definitely came from the Associations, particularly, in the case of Victoria, those elements of the Association which most resolutely opposed the Melbourne CC, including H.H.Budd, who was present at the meeting. By March 1893, the ACC had laid out its proposals for the control of cricket. These included:

- 1)The regulation of the visits of England and other teams to Australia.
- 2)The regulation of Australasian teams to England or elsewhere, in conjunction with the governing bodies of the places visited.
- 3)The settlement of disputes or differences between Associations represented on the Council.
- 4)The alteration or amendment of, or addition to, the laws of cricket in Australasia.³

The ACC was never able to achieve these lofty aims, not least because the resistance of those bodies they were attempting to defeat was too strong. Thus, different groups, generally from the same class, fought each other to win the prestigious prize of cricket and its legitimating ideological authority. Fighting from the basics of loyalties nurtured

1 For the early history see C.Harte, *The History of The Sheffield Shield*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1987), pp.14-25. Importantly, Wardill was intimately involved in the question of the donation and what should be done with it.

2 It seems likely that the name Australasian Cricket Council was a direct echo of the Federal Council.

3 There can be no doubt that this was a programme for the control of Australian cricket on a grander scale than anything gone before, particularly as they intended being the ultimate authority for law making in the country. Also the reference to Australasian, rather than Australian, was made because the ACC hoped that New Zealand would join the new body. Significantly, the same thing occurred with the Federal Constitution, which provided the opportunity for New Zealand to join if it desired. In both cases Australia's neighbour remained aloof.

at a club level, matured in intra-colonial disputes and fired through more general conflicts, the two groups clashed. All this to possess a tool which was perceived to give status, forge bonds within a class, as well as to prove the indefatigable spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Resistance to the ACC (I): The Melbourne CC and the SCG Trust

The first aim of the ACC was never achieved because the Council did not have enough money to tempt cricketers to come out from the old country. Tours continued to be run as previously, remaining private enterprises derived from private initiatives. Through the nineties, with the exception of Lord Sheffield's tour, tours to Australia were jointly controlled by the Melbourne CC and the SCG Trustees. The ultimate aims of running these tours were, in no order of importance: firstly, to promote cricket and to forge the bonds of empire, while aiding the game in Australia; and secondly, to improve the financial situation of the two institutions, directly from profits gained from the tour and indirectly from boosting their membership rolls. Both aims would have improved the power and prestige of both institutions, as well as earning the enmity of the VCA and NSWCA. Thus the following tours were brought to the shores of Australia: 1894-95 (captained by A.E.Stoddart); 1897-98 (again captained by Stoddart); and 1901-02 (captained by A.C.Maclaren).¹

The profits that were gained for club coffers were enormous, even when divided between the two institutions.² Despite unemployment and mass migration to Western Australia, which followed the crash of the early 1890s,³ the cricket watching public paid and paid some more for the privilege of observing the English teams taking on the colonies and the Australian XI, even at the height of the depression.⁴ This did not

1 The gap of 4 years between the second Stoddart tour and that of Maclaren was the result of the Boer war and the attempts made by the Melbourne CC and other bodies to bring out a Marylebone CC XI from England. The last of these tours was solely controlled by the Melbourne CC.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Sept. 1895. The profits of the Stoddart 1894-95 tour were announced at £3,349 2/- 1d. Thus, each institution cleared over £1,500. The profits for the 1901-02 Maclaren tour were even more staggering when it is considered that it was the Melbourne CC's venture alone. *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 11 July 1902, the club was left with a balance of about £4,800, of which it donated £1,000 to various cricket club's in Melbourne.

3 Davison, *Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, p.14, notes that between 1892 and 1895 Melbourne had a net loss in population of 56,000 people.

4 This is a fascinating phenomenon which occurred again at the time of the 1930s depression. Perhaps the best explanation that can be found for why crowds turned out in such force during a time when work and money was scarce can be found in Cashman, *Ave a Go*, p.40: 'Sport provides an escape from harsh economic realities. It is also true that in difficult times people turn back to and can gain consolation from their traditional cultural roots, such as the established and epic struggle against the mother country on the sporting field. Within the sporting arena there is no depression, or it is forgotten, as the spectator reaffirms his suburban, urban or national identity, or attends the game

please everybody, especially the ACC who seemed impotent in the face of the money-making activities of the two institutions. Neither did it please some English observers. One writing with disdain about the 1894-95 tour said that:

The financial side of the tour was also discussed with an openness that scorned dissemblance and there was never ending merriment when Major Wardill and Mr. Sheridan, in answer to enquiries on the subject, remarked that they had "just turned the corner".¹

The two institutions were being associated with financial businesses, and on the face of it the partnership did seem to be an attempt to rake in the profits and usurp the stated functions of the ACC. However, there is substantial evidence that the Melbourne CC at least was quite happy not to promote tours and let patrons like Lord Sheffield fulfil this function.

Following Lord Sheffield's triumphal tour through the colonies, the Melbourne CC and the SCG Trustees decided to club together to promote a tour to Australia. But the reason for this appears to be that they wanted to prevent a professional XI, at that time being prepared in England, from coming to the colonies.² The ACC actually gave the club and trustees their blessing, most probably because they could not afford to finance a team themselves. Eventually the plans of the club and trustees were dropped because Sheffield was making noises about sponsoring another tour. On 27 June, following a meeting with Phillip Sheridan, the SCG's representative, they cabled Sheffield to the effect that 'we retire absolutely for coming season, general public expect you, will give you every assistance'.³ In the event Sheffield withdrew his plans, and no further moves were made, but the professionals were prevented from touring.

The following season club and trustees were again united in organising a tour for the 1894 season. There were distinct signs that the Melbourne CC would have preferred Lord Sheffield. Sheffield again made approaches about the possibilities of

simply as a diversion'. Interestingly enough, it seems also that membership of a club like the Melbourne CC was one of the last things abandoned by people who possessed it. During the 1890s membership shows an overall growth, with significant drops only in 1892-93, and 1893-94. Examining the figures this seems to suggest that when a tour factor is taken into account (a tour by an English team naturally boosts membership figures), apart from the 2 years mentioned, the club was unaffected: 1890-1 = 2604; 91-2 = 2817; 92-3 = 2800; 93-4 = 2678; 94-5 = 3139; 95-6 = 2927; 96-97 = 3013. (Tour years were 91-92, 94-95. The source for these figures was the Annual Report of 1898). The worst year coincides with the trough of the depression when the fall was 122, but this in itself was not catastrophic. Even in this year there were still 215 people that took up membership, a far lower figure than normal, but still showing that not everybody was suffering from the slump to the same extent.

1 F.G.Aflalo, 'Sport at Home and Abroad', *The Empire Review*, Vol.1, (1901), p.558.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 Jan. 1893.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 27 June. 1893.

coming to Australia, despite the fact that the partnership had already made an agreement with Stoddart for the following season in November 1893. But once the club realised that Sheffield was prepared to tour they decided that they would withdraw their agreement with Stoddart in favour of Sheffield, although they did also decide to inform the Earl that they had previously made an agreement with Stoddart but expected that the Earl could approach him in England to square things.¹ This did not actually come to pass; once again Sheffield decided to abandon his plans, and thus the joint venture went ahead and Stoddart toured Australia.

Why were the Melbourne CC so enthusiastic about getting Lord Sheffield to tour? It is probably a combination of two different factors. Firstly, it gave them power and prestige, whereby they could act as agents for the Lord, secure the best matches in the colonies and bask in reflected glory. They proved their credentials by offering their hospitality. This was certainly the feeling behind the committee's report to the club in 1892, which recorded that

It is gratifying to know that the noble Earl greatly appreciated the welcome accorded to him and to the members of his team in this pavilion, and to the whole action of the club towards him throughout his visit.²

By entertaining the grandee of Sussex cricket and by managing his affairs they could associate themselves with his prestige. Secondly, by bringing out Sheffield they were able to boost their membership, or at least keep it high in years of economic depression. They were enabled to stabilise their finances without incurring a risk. These roles certainly prevented them from being accused of being an exploitative, profit-making body, a charge that was occasionally made at a later date.

Much the same motivations may have been at work when the club actively encouraged the Marylebone CC to bring out a representative English team. In 1899, while the Australian XI were on tour in Britain, Major Wardill, secretary of the Melbourne CC, and manager of the XI, had a series of discussions about a number of matters, ranging from the laws of cricket, to the control of international matches. As regards the latter it was Wardill who approached the Marylebone CC and asked them if they would be responsible for the next team to be sent out to Australia.³ To this end the Marylebone CC established a sub-committee which was ordered to look at the feasibility of this idea, although it appears that their initial reaction had been positive.⁴

¹ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Nov. 1893.

² *Minutes of the A.G.M.*, 10 Sept. 1892.

³ *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 19 June 1899.

⁴ *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 26 June 1899.

It is very unlikely that Wardill was acting on his own initiative and most probably the Melbourne CC had sanctioned his approach to the Lord's administrators.

By January 1900 the Melbourne CC had decided willingly to act as agents for the Marylebone CC England XI,¹ and it was only when the Marylebone cancelled due to the combination of not being able to raise a representative XI and the Boer war that the engagement was cancelled.² But this did not stop the Melbourne CC conferring with Marylebone about the possibility of a tour in the future, and the same reared its head in the following season. Once again the Marylebone cancelled, but not before the Melbourne CC had agreed to act as agents, setting a programme for the tour and arranging fixtures and finances.³ On this occasion the Melbourne CC arranged, as a stop-gap measure, to bring an England XI out under the captaincy of A.C. Maclaren. Eventually, it was 1903 before the Marylebone CC sent a side. Once again they had been prompted into this course of action by the Melbourne CC who had asked Major Wardill to broach the matter while he was managing the 1902 Australian tour to England. This was duly done and the tour eventually went ahead with the Melbourne CC co-ordinating the tour for the English club.

Given the profits that the club had made by running tours from England this enthusiasm for a visit by the Marylebone might appear to be very surprising. Certainly all they had to gain in financial terms was the takings from games held on their ground. Meanwhile the coming of the Marylebone did not displease the Associations. The NSWCA had expressed a preference for the Marylebone CC as early as March 1902, when they had actually cabled Lord's 'expressing a hope that in future English teams visiting Australia will be regulated by the MCC [Marylebone]'.⁴ This view is hardly surprising given the attitude of the Associations to the club, trustees and players. The Marylebone tour was one of those rare occasions in Australian cricket when everyone seemed to be in accord and all would have endorsed the assertion of the Melbourne CC's committee that they would 'welcome with great pleasure the advent of a team under the management of the highest cricketing institution in the world'.⁵ It appeared that an orgy of self-satisfaction and mother-country love was about to be indulged in. But at the same time one has to consider that the Melbourne CC was giving away its international inheritance in a way that it had wanted to do to Lord Sheffield. One must conclude that the motivation for this lies in its desire to be associated with the 'premier' club in the world and to be seen to do good for the game in Australia.

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 22 Jan. 1900.

2 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 12 Feb. 1900.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 16 May 1901.

4 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 10 Mar. 1902.

5 *Minutes of the A.G.M.*, 11 Sept. 1903.

To the Associations the Australian XI had been a consistent thorn in the flesh and with the formation of the Council they aimed to curb its powers and improve the tarnished image of Australian cricket in England. At the same time the ACC hoped to legitimate their position as the leading cricket body in Australia. However, like its attempt to bring English touring teams into its sphere of influence this was destined to failure. Its attempt to control the selection of the 1893 Australian XI had resulted in widespread criticism,¹ while its appointment of Victor Cohen, treasurer of the NSWCA, as manager was as unhappy as it was undiplomatic, given the uneasy relationship between the players and the VCA and NSWCA. The selection of the 1896 tour was if anything more unpopular. The players were up in arms against the Council, and the Council was impotent in response. The ACC had omitted from its side Clem Hill and J.J.Kelly. This was overruled by the team who promptly selected them.² Furthermore, although the Council had negotiated the tour with the Marylebone CC, because they were in severe financial straits the tour remained strictly a joint-stock venture and therefore many people in England continued to think of the side as a team of professionals.³

The council was further undermined in 1896 by the attempts of the SCG trustees to hijack its role as the organiser of international tours. From 1895 the trustees had been pushing the Melbourne CC into joining it in sending the Australian XI to England. The Melbourne CC reacted negatively to this, having decided in August 1895 that:

1 Pollard, *Turbulent Years*, pp.4-5. Apparently they chose Arthur Conningham for the sole reason that they wanted a Qu^{een}slander in the side. In the process they overlooked E.Jones, a South Australian, who was, by the accounts of both players and spectators, a far more talented cricketer. They also included George Giffen's brother, Walter, and the rumour was that this had been done to appease George, who, it had been said, had refused to tour without him.

2 The ACC had also originally included wicket-keeper Jack Harry and then had dropped him in favour of Melbourne CC cricketer A.E.Johns. This had caused a further outcry as Harry was immensely popular and he was able to claim the sum of £160 in compensation from the already impoverished council.

3 This was one of the direct causes of a strike by several English professionals before the Oval test match of 1896. The demands of the strikers were for more money, while hinting that some of the English amateurs and all the Australians were being paid better for the game. See above chapter 2. More sardonically, *Athletic News*..., (7 Sept. 1896), p.1, printed a cartoon of the Australian's sailing away in boat called 'The Golden Fleece' which was loaded to the gunwales with overflowing bags of money. The reaction to the money made by the Australians had been quite bad and before the 1899 tour *The Bulletin*, (16 July 1898), p.24, commented ascerbicly: 'One of the shrewdest of Australian cricketers, Joe Darling, prophesies trouble in the English professional ranks when the Australians go to England next March. Most of the English pros. have agreed to demand a bigger share in the spoils, arguing that the Australians are as much pros. as they are. Another big question next year will be the status of Australians in England, hitherto treated as amateurs when on tour'.

after renewed consideration of the project and viewing the existence of circumstances at the present time which in the opinion of the committee are adverse to the advisability of their engaging in the proposed enterprise, this committee would urge its abandonment by the trustees and the club.¹

The trustees continued pushing but to no avail, except that they and the club decided to lend the XI £300 free of interest. But it was the players that kept jibing at the ACC, constantly reminding them that they had no obligations towards the body. George Giffen, in particular, made scathing remarks about the Council;

If it [the ACC] financed the tours, the position would be entirely different, but it did not take upon its shoulders one iota of financial responsibility; as in former years, the players had to bear the whole of what risk there was...This being the case, it seems to me that the players should be allowed to select the team themselves.²

This was published in 1898 at a highly topical time when the ACC, in conjunction with the local Associations in Victoria and NSW, were launching a final do-or-die attack upon the Melbourne CC which, at the invitation of the players,³ had decided to take upon its shoulders the organisation of the next tour to England.⁴ By aligning themselves with the 1899 XI the club was immediately allied with the players and the SACA; the former because they constituted the team, the latter because the Association was closely connected with the South Australian players and was frequently in opposition with the other two major Associations. The club was thrust into opposition with the ACC on the 'national' level and was further alienated from the VCA and clubs like the East Melbourne on the colonial and local level. This dispute, like many of the others, was explicitly about who had the right to control cricket on every level.

By June 1898 matters relating to the ACC were already coming to a head. In the last week of that month R.W.McLeod, one of the Melbourne CC's delegates on the VCA, had proposed that the Association withdraw from the ACC due to the expense and ineptitude of that body.⁵ This was put to the Association at a meeting the following week and was lost on the casting vote of the president, A.E.Clarke, president and co-

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 6 Aug. 1895.

2 Giffen, *With Bat and Ball*, p.91.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 20 June 1898. The club had been approached in letters received on that date by players representing the three major cricket colonies (Hugh Trumble, Joe Darling, F.Iredale).

4 Organisation, lending the team money to be paid back when they had taken enough to cover the debt and letting the Secretary of the club, Major Wardill, go as manager of the team.

5 *Leader*, (2 July 1898), p.17.

founder of the East Melbourne CC.¹ By early September the dispute had reached a climax with a meeting between the ACC and the Melbourne CC. It was an attempt to find a compromise, but as such it failed. The club made its plans clear and dictated its terms. It intended fully bringing out the next English team and sending the next Australian XI 'Home'. To this end it was prepared to share some of its profits from a tour by an English XI with the Associations.² But what was most interesting about the club's stance was the statement made by the president of the club, F.G.Smith. He explained that the Melbourne CC was recognised as the true sponsors of Australian and international cricket at 'Home' in England:

They would allow him to say that so long as 25 years ago the MCC [Melbourne] introduced to Australia an English Eleven...In 1878 it brought out a second eleven...in 1888, an eleven captained by the present Lord Hawke. All these visits were exclusively inaugurated and managed and carried on by the MCC. In 1891 the Earl of Sheffield brought out his eleven, which was really managed by the Melbourne club. In 1894 and 1897 English elevens visited Australia under the auspices of the MCC and the trustees of the Sydney Cricket Ground...The MCC had thus become known in England, and having given its invitation to the next eleven, it felt it was quite impossible to withdraw from that position...It [the Melbourne CC] was not a selfish organisation...but it looked upon itself as, in a sense the trustee of what came into its hands, and who should see that it was administered for the good of the game.³

The club was proposing itself as the most legitimate authority in Australian cricket and some of the council bought this point of view. Mr.Moir, a member of the South Melbourne CC, was quite prepared to support the Melbourne CC's claims and proposals. However, the majority of the meeting proposed, although several members did not vote, - 'That this council send the next Australian team to England, and finance or control same, in accordance with object B of the council's constitution'.⁴ Meanwhile *The Leader* reported that the English *Cricket* Magazine had announced the visit of the Australian XI in glowing terms.

The ACC was all but beaten, but this did not prevent resistance from within the circuits of Victorian Cricket, where A.E.Clarke made the running. Speaking at the A.G.M. of the East Melbourne CC a few days after the impasse, Clarke was highly

1 *Leader*, (9 July 1898), p.18. This threw 'Mid-On', the correspondent who was a great supporter of the Melbourne CC, into a paroxysm of rage. He stated that 'it would be a good thing for cricket in this colony if the MCC were placed in the administrative position occupied by its great English prototype'.

2 *Leader*, (3 Sept. 1898), pp.17-18. It intended to give 50% of the profits, to be divided on a ratio of 35;35;30.

3 *Leader*, (3 Sept. 1898), pp.17-18.

4 *Leader*, (3 Sept. 1898), pp.17-18.

critical of the stance taken by the premier club. In a hostile speech, which was apparently 'heartily cheered' at every point he made, he suggested that: it was a bad thing for the Melbourne CC to have control of all international matches; it was wrong that all intercolonial matches should be played on the MCG; the Melbourne CC had wrongly distributed £500 in gifts to clubs rather than giving that sum to the VCA, because it did not wish to give the Association 'the sinews of war'; the Melbourne CC assuming the managerial role in international matches was 'the death knell of cricket in the colony'; and, finally, that it was the duty of all Victorian clubs to support the NSWCA.¹ This speech was a clear rebuttal of the Melbourne CC's interference in cricket organisation, but the implications of it were that Clarke felt that the role the Melbourne CC was playing in cricket should be assumed by the VCA and the NSWCA, with the East Melbourne CC naturally playing a part in the process by staging intercolonial and international fixtures upon its ground in Jolimont. Once again on every level this was a dispute about power, prestige and finance.

The 1899 tour to England was a success and the club felt that it achieved glory from this. The players too seemed happy with the arrangement, for in return for the patronage of the club, they kept their prior financial arrangements and challenged the authority of the disliked ACC. Both parties in the deal were in an enviable position. The Melbourne CC risked little financial loss and no financial gain, but could be recognised at 'Home' as one of the most powerful and important cricket institutions in Australia. The players kept their joint-stock organisation, while having the benefit of semi-official legitimisation in the form of the Melbourne CC's patronage. The only body which really seemed to suffer was the ACC which slipped quietly into oblivion in 1899, thus leaving Melbourne CC in a strong position at all levels of Australian cricket. Indeed, a measure of their strength is demonstrated by the approach made by the VCA in 1901 for the club to take over its functions.

And yet, when the ACC disbanded, the problems that had caused the conflict in the first place did not disappear. The tensions which bedevilled Australian cricket remained, particularly in the relationship between the NSWCA and its players,² as well as the NSWCA and the SCG Trustees. In Victoria the same problems remained as before. The hegemony of the Melbourne CC was still frequently challenged, but was not overthrown until a few years later. Before this occurred the club once again united with the players to take a tour to England. Their motivation for this was unequivocally

¹ *Leader*, (10 Sept. 1898), p.17. The following week in *Leader*, (17 Sept. 1898), p.17, 'Mid-On', who was extremely riled by Clarke's speech, accused the East Melbourne president of thinking that the initials 'MCC' stood for 'Mustn't control cricket'.

² M.P.Sharp, 'Moral Metaphor, Economic Reality and Public Perceptions: The Control of Cricket and Rugby in Sydney, 1890-1912', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.5, no.3 (1988), pp.331-4.

stated in the *Minutes*, which read 'that in view of the desirability of continuing international cricket under the auspices of the MCC [Melbourne] the secretary Major Wardill be granted leave of absence to manage the next Australian XI in England, as calculated to promote the interests of the club'.¹

The ACC was founded by the Associations to control international cricket and to mediate in cricket disputes, but its position was undermined by the financially powerful alliance of the Melbourne CC, the SCG Trust and the players. Between 1890 and 1904, it was these agencies that had effective control of the resources, both ideological and material, which enabled them to profit in money and status terms. The arrival of the Marylebone CC went a small way to undermining this position, although at first the tour merely seemed to support the *status quo* of Australian cricket. However, the Melbourne CC and its friends and allies were about to be attacked in a similar way to the assault in the early 1890s, but in a more concerted and organised manner. This attack was to come mainly through the auspices of the two most powerful cricket Associations, the VCA and the NSWCA, who were convinced that the money the Melbourne CC and the Australian players were making was against the spirit of the game.² However, they too were looking to capitalise upon the profits of the game and so place themselves in a superior position. As previously, the battle was between different sections of the dominant class over who were the rightful guardians and beneficiaries of the game.

III

The Board of Control Crisis, 1905-12

The examination of Australian cricket up to 1905 has revealed, so far, the extent to which cricket's organisation was divided. As we have seen, it was not a division along class or national lines. It was possible for two parties, of different social or colonial backgrounds to unite, if it helped them achieve their own aims. Thus, although the social composition of the East Melbourne CC and the Melbourne CC were broadly

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 27 Jan. 1902. The implications of this statement seem to be absolutely clear. The Melbourne CC felt that their involvement with the Australian XI widened their sphere of influence.

2 This is the crux of Sharp's argument in 'Moral Metaphor, Economic Reality and Public Perceptions', pp.335-41. As he says, 'officials saw themselves as the guardians of sporting purity, the amateur ideal, and the notion that cricket and rugby were more than games - they were character building models for later life. According to officials, players and groups like the Melbourne CC could not be trusted with this task as their pecuniary interests would provide an overwhelming conflict of ideals'. This does, however, overstate the case not least because the Melbourne CC and at least some of the players upheld the same values, claiming that they too were guardians of the game. The point of this thesis is to explain this seeming paradox by putting the disputes into the context of class and status position within a class, demonstrating that what they were fighting over was not simply control over sport but prestige and status.

similar, they were frequently in confrontation. Likewise, although the Melbourne CC and the SCG Trustees were from different colonies with supposedly different local loyalties, after 1887, they formed a convenient, firm, if uneasy, alliance. The social composition of the Australian XI was mixed; bankers, clerks and postmen rubbing shoulders for the greater glory of their country and their bank balances. But this did not prevent them from having a degree of unanimity with the socially prestigious Melbourne CC. Likewise, within the XI, colonial or state differences were often sunk for the common purpose of the team. In turn, these factors demonstrate that historical ideas about colonial and Australian nationalism, and historical and sociological ideas about hegemony, while being important, can be too simple.¹

1905 saw the nexus of these relationships with a conflict which started with the revival of the idea of a Council in opposition to the 'private' bodies and the players and ended with a triumph for the new institution over these opponents. Throughout the clash loyalties were generally derived from the local level, in other words to the club to which the individual belonged with, perhaps, the exception of the players, whose loyalty generally lay with the vague formation of the Australian XI. The lines of battle were not drawn along the boundaries of class, regional loyalty or country-wide nationalism, but they did involve ideas about these things. As has been seen, cricket's ideology was in many ways the epitome of bourgeois belief. Meanwhile the antagonists in the dispute often flung accusations at each other of being unpatriotic, or more particularly, un-Australian. Each party felt that it held a legitimate position, and that it was playing fair. Each party believed that it was the true upholder of cricket's faith. It

1 Mandle's work, while being important, illustrating key points about cricket and nationalism, was an overstatement. This thesis demonstrates that while cricket did produce nationalism it also helped to reinforce colonial regionalism, as well as producing other tensions surrounding class and gender. Consequently, Mandle's statement in 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism' that 'Australian cricket was, by the 1890s, a successful symbol of what national co-operation could achieve...' (p.241) is less tenable, although this does not detract from the importance of his identification of the nationalist possibilities of Australian cricket. Nevertheless, historians writing general histories of Australian nationalism have followed his lead, incl. McLachlan, *Waiting for the Revolution*; Frost, *The 1861/2 All-England Cricket Eleven Visit to Melbourne*; Alomes, *A Nation at Last?*; Inglis, 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England'. Moreover, Mandle's examination of cricket being used as a proof of non-deterioration of the Australian race has influenced White's *Inventing Australia*, pp.72-3, and McQueen, *A New Britannia*, p.268. As far as hegemony is concerned, the most obvious proponent has been B.Stoddart, especially in *Saturday Afternoon Fever*, although as has been seen above, chapters 1 and 5, his ideas range further than pure hegemony. Hegemonic themes are also explored in G.Lawrence, D.Rowe (eds.), *Power Play: The Commercialisation of Australian Sport*, especially in McKay's essay 'Hegemony, the State and Australian Sport'. The belief that sport was part of the dominant class's hegemony in Australia was anticipated by Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.127.

was an argument about who held the most status through the possession or control of cricket.

The formation of the Board of Control

The idea of a new ACC had never died despite that body's defeat in the late 1890s. The two major Associations bided their time until the Council could be resurrected in a more powerful form. That time must have seemed ripe following the tour of the Marylebone CC to Australia. Thus, a conference was held in Sydney in the early days of 1905 to discuss the possibility of forming a Board. By the 20 January the provisional rules of the Board were announced. These were remarkably similar to those of the old ACC;

To control, regulate, and if necessary, finance the visits of English teams to Australia; To control, regulate, and if necessary, finance the visits of the Australian teams to England or elsewhere, either solely or in conjunction with the governing cricket bodies of the places visited;...the alteration of, or addition to, the laws of cricket in Australia.¹

The initial representation on the Board was on a fairly broad basis. Each of the constituent Associations were allowed two representatives elected annually. There was to be one representative from the Australian XI and one other player who had participated in the Sheffield Shield, also elected annually. There were provisions for the possibility of allowing other Associations to join, and proposals for the financing of the new organisation. Furthermore, they placed themselves in charge of selection for Australian teams, and announced that they would be 'empowered to declare whether the time fixed for the visit of an Australian, English or other team is opportune or otherwise'.² The full proposals represented a scheme by which the Board was to be a federal, centralist organisation controlling the highest echelons of the Australian game.

These rules and conditions were changed by the middle of the year, with the words 'if necessary' removed, making it seem that the Board was absolutely determined to control the Australian XI and, if a Marylebone team was not touring, to take over the role of the Melbourne CC as the entrepreneurs for visiting English teams. Likewise, the provision for giving player representation was dropped quickly under the

¹ *Leader*, (21 Jan. 1905), p.17.

² *Leader*, (21 Jan. 1905), p.17. Other provisions included a clause which barred any player or 'other person who may receive wages or monetary consideration for playing or umpiring the game of cricket (excepting payment for loss of time)' from serving on the Board.

pretext that they were already represented at club level, and therefore did not need to be given a voice on the Board.¹

Supporters of the Board and their motivations

The VCA and associated clubs

The majority of the clubs that constituted the VCA were initially in favour of the Board with the weighty exceptions of the Melbourne, South Melbourne and Richmond CCs. At the forefront of the movement for establishing the Board were the erstwhile enemies of the Melbourne CC, the East Melbourne and North Melbourne clubs. This was apparent from the earliest days of the dispute. Indeed, E.E.Bean, who was the VCA's representative on the sub-committee which had drawn up the proposals, had said to the Association at a meeting on the 17 January, that 'the establishment of the Board would settle definitely, once and for all the question whether the Victorian Cricket Association was to rule here or the Melbourne Club'.² There can be little doubt that the VCA's major motivation for supporting the Board was to defeat the power of the Melbourne CC. Thus in Victoria, the heart of the matter was undoubtedly a continuation of the old battle, but this time it was for higher stakes. Indeed, while the Melbourne CC remained within the Association,³ the argument stayed along the partisan lines of past years.

The NSWCA

The NSWCA's immediate concern in forming the Board was to curb the power of the players, finally break the SCG Trustees and fully claim the ground that had been built for them, and also wrest the power from the Melbourne CC who they saw as 'the lion in the path' to any settlement of the dispute.⁴ As such they were continuing a line of policy that had been a traditional feature of their attitudes from a much earlier date. There is no doubt that they wanted full control of NSW cricket, as well as to curb what they perceived as the excesses of the players. In this they were supported by the majority of the NSW press, including *The Bulletin* ⁵ which was rabidly in favour of

1 The dropping of player representation was reported in *Leader*, (17 Mar. 1905), p.17.

2 *Argus*, (18 Jan. 1905), p.7. Bean was a lawyer, but was also a prominent member of the North Melbourne CC which was one of the clubs more antagonistic towards the Melbourne CC.

3 They finally split in early May 1906.

4 This was said by W.J.Trickett, M.L.C., and president of the NSWCA to a meeting of the Association, *Sydney Morning Herald*, (9 June 1906), p.11. His full quote was 'The Melbourne Club was the lion in the path. It was trying to thwart the decision of the Associations'.

5 *The Bulletin*, accused the Melbourne CC of 'fighting for the control of the treasury chest', (17 May 1906), p.24. The same edition included a cartoon which pictured evil faced, almost piratical, Asian-like players, stretching huge, grasping hands up to catch a large bag with 'gate-money' written upon it (nb

the Board. Even the *Sydney Morning Herald* was solidly, if moderately, behind the stance of the Associations. For example, it claimed dutifully that the Australian cricketers were 'reaping monetary harvests at their own sweet will',¹ while believing that the Melbourne CC was being 'secret and underhand...seeking the monetary and influential advancement of its proprietors...contrary to its former traditions'.² Because of the extent of support within the state for the position of the Association, the NSWCA was able to endorse fully the VCA. They were undoubtedly worried that the fate of the Board would be decided in Victoria.

Opponents of the Board and their motivations

The Melbourne CC

From the very outset the Melbourne CC were totally opposed to the Board and its aims. The matter had first^{been} raised at committee meeting of the club from the early date of December 1904, when:

Question of Conference (to be held by the Associations at New Year) was discussed at length - importance of the movement as possibly affecting the club fully recognised, but it was felt tha[t no] definite steps could be taken at this stage. Matter to be brought up at the next meeting.³

This minute reveals a degree of anxiety and an acknowledgement that the proposed Board proffered a strong threat to the position of the club. From the very first the club showed complete opposition to the movement. At the VCA meeting of 10 January the Melbourne CC delegate, William Bruce, challenged the proposals being discussed on the grounds that it was too soon to decide anything.⁴ At a later meeting Bruce questioned 'whether the establishment of the board of control...would improve cricket', but added 'he took it that it was simply a personal attack on the Melbourne Cricket Club'.⁵ This was undoubtedly the line that the Melbourne CC took. They believed that the formation of the Board was merely an attempt to attack their power and prestige. This idea was carried through in a circular which was sent out to all clubs in the Association attempting to gauge how much support the club would have in its fight, which was firstly against the VCA and secondly against the Board. The circular sought

Asians were part of *The Bulletin*'s demonology). The cartoon was entitled 'The great cricket war in a nutshell' (p.16).

1 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (20 Mar. 1906), p.10.

2 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (16 June 1906), p.14.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 6 Dec. 1904.

4 *Age*, (11 Jan 1905), p.6.

5 *Age*, (2 Mar. 1905), p.6.

to reassure clubs that the Melbourne CC was loyal to the Association and claimed that it had never wanted to control cricket. It also emphasised its generosity and claimed that in terms of the number of members belonging to the club they were vastly under-represented in the Association.¹ What this document displayed, by being aimed against the VCA, was the extent to which they believed that the Board was an attempt to curb their activities. Later, when South Australia and the players became involved for different but related reasons, this aspect of the club's motives for opposing the Board would be conveniently forgotten, swept under the carpet by rhetoric emphasising the need for a fully representative Board, with the players and South Australia represented fairly. Once they had forged alliances later in the dispute they attacked the Board on two fronts, one being a local initiative, with an attempt to establish district cricket, the other on an international level, when they tried to persuade the Marylebone CC to send out a team under their auspices. Nevertheless, as far as the Melbourne CC was concerned the conflict was really local, about a clash between different clubs.

The supporters of the Melbourne CC, at the local level

There were basically two different components to this group. The first comprised of South Melbourne and Richmond, the two Association clubs which declared themselves opposed to the Board. The second was the League of Victorian Cricketers, which consisted of lowlier clubs than those on the Association. As far as the two Association clubs were concerned it is hard to fathom why they should have thrown their lot in with the Melbourne CC. Indeed, they may have been motivated by a number of reasons, but most likely, they were opposed to the Board due to it being a centralist organisation; or they may have felt like William Bruce that 'the Association was blindly following the lead of the Sydney Association'.² We can, however, be more certain about the League clubs. Realising that these institutions might have some part to play, the Melbourne CC made an attempt to foster deliberately their support. Talks were held with the League during February and March of 1905 and there were signs that they would support the Melbourne CC if the club could guarantee its support in promoting the League's interests.³ Eventually, in 1906, this relationship came to fruition with a scheme drawn up and promoted by the Melbourne CC for introducing District Cricket with the aid of the League.⁴ They thus attempted to institute a new organisation called

¹ *Leader*, (11 Feb. 1905), p.17.

² *Leader*, (17 Mar. 1905), p.17.

³ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 21 Feb., 7 Mar., 10 Mar., 13 Mar. 1905.

⁴ *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 4 May 1906. This cricket was to be electorally based. Within weeks there were district clubs forming in different areas of Melbourne, including Prahran CC and Caulfield CC.

the Victorian Cricket League (VCL) which was a direct challenge to the Association.¹ The pattern of local support in the dispute in Victoria seems to indicate that each club supported the side they thought would give them the better deal. As far as negotiating with the League was concerned the Melbourne CC certainly held the upper-hand over the Association because the VCA had never done anything for the League.²

The SCG Trust

Thirty years of conflict between the SCG trustees and the NSWCA had culminated in a court case over whether the Association had priority right to use of the cricket ground. The case was heard in 1904 and a victory was won for the Association. Nevertheless, the trustees continued to resist the will of the Association and remained prepared to ally with the Melbourne CC as they had done in the past. Undoubtedly the motivation for this support was in part a desire to see the vested interests of the Trust triumph over the vested interests of the Association. The Melbourne CC was the most useful allies for this purpose. Thus, they were prepared to make an agreement with the Melbourne CC that if the club enticed an England team to tour then the use of the SCG would be theirs. When the Association realised this they did everything in their power to finally defeat the Trust.³

1 The VCL/VCA split mirrors in name an earlier sporting schism from 1897, when the Victorian Football League had formed out of the Victorian Football Association. It is also reminiscent of the Football League forming from the Football Association and the Rugby League's schism with Union.

2 The picture is, however, somewhat more fluid than might be imagined. For example, the case of Essendon reveals that not all League clubs were supportive of the Melbourne CC. They decided to throw in their lot with the VCA, probably hoping that in the event of an Association victory they would be admitted wholesale to that body, which is exactly what happened. Meanwhile some on the Association wavered and considered joining the new organisation. From early May 1906 the University CC debated defecting from the ranks of the Association.

3 It took a long time for the devious arrangement to come to light. What appears to have happened is that in November 1905 while there was a lull in the fighting, the Melbourne CC had started to make preparations for a tour. On 3 November the committee decided to write to the SCG Trustees to discover if the ground was free for such a purpose, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 3 Nov. 1905. In *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 Dec. 1905, the following entry is found: 'Sydney Trustees. Letter of 30 Novem./05 from the secretary (Mr.S.H.Fairland) read & noted & considered very satisfactory. -'. This almost certainly means that the Trustees had granted the request, a piece of collusion that was not discovered or suspected until much later.

The Players

As previously stated, the players for some time had been under attack, especially regarding their status as amateurs. All bodies involved in the dispute paid lip-service to the amateur creed and the NSWCA in particular was anxious to curb what they perceived as player excesses. Needless to say, the players defended their position with vigour. Their aim in the dispute was to preserve their independence and they obviously believed that the best chance they had of achieving this was by allying themselves, once again, with the Melbourne CC. To this end, all the leading players signed an agreement with the club to play against an English team, if one was brought out by the club. Their reason for doing so was succinctly stated by Monty Noble, who was the Player's spokesman in New South Wales. He said that the Melbourne CC

has for some time past been instrumental in the introduction of English teams to this part of the empire, and as the Marylebone Club could not see its way to accept the invitation tendered by the Board of Control, the players feel they are justified in accepting a team introduced by that body.¹

It is obvious that they felt their best chance of survival lay in fighting their corner hand-in-hand with the Melbourne CC.²

The SACA

SACA's main objection to the Board was based around similar things to the other parties. They were in particular insistent that the Board would only finance the players 'if necessary', and towards the end of the dispute this proved to be a major stumbling block to a settlement. It seems that the SACA were particularly loyal to their players, who were well represented on the Association. At the same time it is likely that there was some lingering resentment about the hegemony of the two larger Associations. Given the history of the SACA it is not surprising that they took this course of action and supported the Melbourne CC.

The role of the Marylebone CC

All parties involved attempted to gain the sanction of the Marylebone CC. In 1905 the first approaches were made to the club in London. On 29 March the Melbourne CC

¹ *Leader*, 19 May 1906, p.17.

² Only one player in NSW withdrew from the agreement with the Melbourne CC. This was the Rev.E.F.Waddy, who said that 'whilst appreciating the tremendous amount of good your club has done to Australian cricket in the past, I still think that recent actions have not been in accordance with past traditions', *Sydney Morning Herald*, (11 June 1906), p.5.

sent what must have appeared a very cryptic message to the Marylebone club; 'Does your Club intend sending next team if not this club proposes to do so and wish your assistance. Board of control not endorsed by s.a.c.a.[sic] or this club'.¹ The Marylebone CC, who had never heard of the Board of Control, were baffled and sent a cable back to that effect. But on the 7 April Major Morkham, as representative for the Melbourne CC, had a meeting with the Marylebone committee and clarified the picture. Marylebone then announced what became their hard-and-fast policy; 'the MCC could not negotiate with any body which was not fully representative of all cricket interests in Australia'.² Ten days later, the Board started canvassing the Marylebone CC, sending a cable that said 'Australian Board of Control send greeting cordially inviting Marylebone team next year writing fully by next mail...[sic]'.³ But by that time the die of Marylebone policy had been cast for the term of the dispute and despite the best efforts of all parties it did not budge one imperial inch from the policy that they would not send a team to Australia 'next year, nor send one until the present trouble...had ended'.⁴

The resolution of the crisis: how the Melbourne CC was beaten

The isolation of the allies of the Melbourne CC

The Melbourne CC was hounded and then beaten by the forces that formed the Board. By August 1906 they were forced to concede. One of the most important steps in this direction was the isolation of its allies. In New South Wales both the SCG Trustees and the players were forced into an impossible situation. Part of the reason for this was the unanimity with which the Association acted and the extent of support that was shown by the press and public.

The immediate reaction to the news that the players had signed an agreement with the Melbourne CC was for them to be banned by the NSWCA. This ban was supported and carried out by all the clubs to which the players belonged. From this time onwards Noble, Trumper and the others were completely isolated in the State. Meanwhile the Association, and therefore the Board, were being given support by different organisations. These included: the Public Schools Amateur Athletic Association; the

1 *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 29 Mar 1905.

2 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 7 Apr. 1905.

3 *Minutes of the Marylebone CC*, 17 Apr. 1905.

4 Laver, *An Australian Cricketer on Tour*, p.157.

This statement was made to a group of Australian players who had met the Melbourne CC committee to discuss the crisis. For the year following both sides in the dispute continued to canvass the Marylebone CC, but to no avail. For example, the *Minutes of the Melbourne CC*, 7 Mar. 1906 read, that it was resolved 'that in view of the failure of the proposed Board of Control to induce the Marylebone CC to send a team to Australia for the season 1906/7, and in order to avoid the lapsing of the bi-yearly international visits the Melbourne CC and the s.a.c. association [sic] invite the Marylebone CC to send a team to Australia this coming season'. See above ch.4.

Cyclists' Association; the Shoalhaven Cricket Association; and the New South Wales Amateur Athletics Association. Meanwhile for the players there were one or two lone voices in the press.¹ The rest was ridicule. Nevertheless they stood firm in the face of mounting criticism and refused to back down from the agreement until released by the Melbourne CC which, once cornered, was happy to do oblige. The players had been assured on 16 June that the Board did not intend to interfere with their powers of financing and joint-stock organisation, and therefore had no further part to play in the settlement. Their battle with the Board was to come in 1912. However, the very fact that there was little support for the case of the players in NSW immeasurably weakened the hand of the Melbourne CC.

With the SCG Trust the matter was slightly different with greater attritional pressure placed upon them to buckle under to the Association and Board. In May 1906 politician W.J.Trickett had been appointed to the Trust. As he was also president of the NSWCA it appears that the Government had deliberately appointed him as a hatchet man. Trickett immediately set to work and at a committee meeting on 1 June he confronted the other trustees, attempting to find out about the agreement with the Melbourne CC. Thus commenced the work of discrediting them in the hope of breaking their power over the ground once and for all. Trickett was confronted with what appeared to be complete intransigence from the trustees who included C.N.J.Oliver, (civil servant in the Department of Lands, and Chief Commissioner of Railways); Sir M.H.Stephen (retired Judge, Senior Vice-President of the NSWCA); Sir William Lynne (politician, now in the federal government, a radical liberal and lover of sports); Sir John See (merchant and politician, a political ally of Lynne); and William Houston (Public servant in the department of Lands). These men presented a relatively homogeneous political and social group and the introduction of Trickett did nothing to change this as he was a moderate liberal. But when it came to cricket administration there was a wide gulf between them which can only be explained in terms of vested interests.

The meeting of 1 June was acrimonious. Trickett announced that he wanted the Trust to be reconstituted. He did not mince his words stating 'I am not here to be catechised...or to occupy a place where star chamber business is done...I am here to do

¹ For example, one correspondent wrote in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, (14 Mar. 1906), p.12: 'I am against amateurs in all British sports being paid, but surely they should not be losers when men like Trumper are giving enjoyment to thousands...The Association has done an immense amount of good, but the executive, in my humble opinion, has never been a success, and the sooner it is altered the better'. So concerned were the Melbourne CC about the 'many mis-statements that are being spread there' in Sydney, that they actually appointed a representative in that city to answer the accusations made in the press, *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 22 May, 1906.

my duty to the public'.¹ Lynne answered with the case for the Trust; 'the cricketers should form an association to control the game'. 'After we had spent all the money on the ground it was not the thing for anyone else to come in and take it', he continued.² The meeting, and thus the dispute, was deadlocked. But by the next meeting of 11 June there had been a remarkable *volte-face* by the trustees, especially Lynne. According to the *Sydney Morning Herald* at the instance of Trickett the trustees 'decided to make every effort to terminate the present deadlock', while Lynne said that he had 'no doubt that the Melbourne CC was trying to control the whole thing', and 'if I had my way I would not give them the ground'.³ A motion was passed at the meeting promising that the Trust would cooperate with the Associations in seeking a solution to the dispute. In the time that intervened between the two meetings the resolve of the NSWCA had been shown. Trickett was daily receiving support from all quarters, while the Association had, on 5 June, suspended all players who had signed the agreement with the Melbourne CC. Sydney's leading papers were continuing their resolute stance against the opponents of the Board and although the players were now unanimous in their support for the Melbourne CC they were still concerned enough to cable the club that they were 'anxious you confer with all associations with view to joint invitation being extended Marylebone Club, to ensure representative team [sic]'.⁴ Meanwhile Trickett was attacking on all fronts, accusing the Trust of insulting him while insisting that the Melbourne CC was 'the lion in the path' to a settlement, and that the Trustees were in full support of that body.⁵ With this sort of pressure and publicity it was not in the interests of a politician like Sir William Lynne, or public figures like Oliver, to resist the public will. Within Sydney the players and the Trust were isolated and the seeming arrogance of the trustees, if it did not lose them votes, would certainly not have been conducive to their public standing or popularity. It was easier for them to cave-in under the combined pressure of Trickett, the Association and the press, than to continue on a course that would bring them nothing but unpopularity. There was also an element of

1 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (2 June 1906), p.12.

2 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (2 June 1906), p.12.

3 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (12 June 1906), p.6. Oliver also said 'the Melbourne club must be condemned...if the members of that club would not join in with the associations, the associations would have to move without them'. Lynne's follow-up statement was perhaps even more extraordinary given his previous attitudes. He did not know, 'until very lately that the Melbourne club assumed the right to speak for all the clubs in Australia...There should be a combined body to control the game'.

4 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (7 June 1906), p.8.

5 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (9 June 1906), p.14. His opening remarks to the Association had been: 'The insulting and unworthy remarks and motives...that were levelled at me unchecked during the two meetings of the trust that I attended I can afford personally to ignore, but as your representative I resent them, and if persisted I fear that the association has little chance of obtaining that co-operation which the trustees should afford the association'.

self-preservation in their capitulation, for even when they bowed to the pressure, they refused to show Trickett the correspondence between them and the Melbourne CC. At the same time, while agreeing to most of what Trickett had said, they amended his motion to be sent to the Melbourne CC which had originally asked not for the cooperation of the club but a complete climb-down.¹ Despite this, the actions of the trustees had left the club with one less ally and in the unavailability of the SCG one less pawn to be used in the larger game against the Associations.

Meanwhile, in Adelaide, by mid-June the SACA was showing signs of moderating its demands. Certain actions by the VCA had gone a long way to achieving this situation. On 15 June the VCA issued a definition of how the Board regarded the future financing of Australian teams, which certainly went far to mollifying the South Australians. In their communique the VCA stated that the Board would provide all necessary funds to send teams away and that the manager of the team would be appointed by the players and more-or-less rubber stamped by the Board. Crucially the Board would not interfere with player profits. It seemed, as well, that they were nearing a compromise over representation on the Board.² It must be certain that the Melbourne CC were aware of the possibility of losing one of their last allies on the national level.

The political resolution: The Club and the MCG Trustees.

There had during June been a degree of unanimity between the VCA and the Melbourne CC on the necessity of securing a visit of a representative English team. Meanwhile the Melbourne CC had ploughed on with its support for the VCL and district cricket. Negotiations with the VCA continued apace, but by the 23 June the club was still not relenting. They were, however, looking for a way out of the malaise, presumably because they felt that with the support of the League they had a strong enough advantage to retain some control and influence over Victorian cricket. On that date Mitchell had explained that 'if thoroughly representative, there was no objection to a Board of Control but that a new body had been formed and the MCC could not leave it in the lurch'.³ On 25 June there were further signs that the club might be relaxing its position as a special committee meeting had been called to discuss the possibility of a negotiated settlement, as well as a cable from Noble which said that the release of the players from the agreement might ease the situation. This last item must have been a reply to a query by the club about this course of action.⁴

1 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (9 June 1906), p.6.

2 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (16 June 1906), p.14.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 23 June 1906.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 25 June 1906.

It appears that the committee were seeking a compromise whereby an English team would come out and they would retain at least some influence and power over their local rivals. Their motives at this time were a mixture of self-interest and the desire to see an English team come out for the good of Australian cricket. By 26 June, however, the state of the club within the dispute had been turned upside down. Overnight their influence was practically destroyed by the outmanoeuvring of the VCA with the connivance of the MCG Trustees and the politicians in the Lands Department appointed by the Bent Ministry. The 25 June was the last day of the club's hegemony over Victorian cricket and by the 26 June it no longer cast the long shadow of previous years over the Australian and international scene.

The Melbourne CC had always had trustees who were supposed to be the people who controlled the cricket ground and any events, or developments, that took place upon it. This was the standard policy of a government which had granted land for a specific use outwith of the colonial state's provenance. For most of the history of the club the government had appointed trustees at the suggestion of the club, therefore the trust was merely an extension of the Melbourne CC itself. Then, in 1896, the government decided to appoint Major T.F.Morkham, an architect in the Land's Department, to the trust rather than H.C.A.Harrison who had been the nomination of the club.¹ This, however, did not create a problem, as Morkham happened to be a member and avid supporter of the club. Rather than representing the interests of the Government Department he decided that his loyalty lay with the Melbourne CC. However, this was a hint of the trouble that was to come. In October 1905, while the Board of Control dispute was simmering, the Bent Government decided to appoint six new trustees to the three that already existed. So concerned were the club that they took legal counsel about the validity of the appointments.² Counsel's opinion was neutral and the matter was left in the hands of the president, Roderick Murchison, who was requested by the committee 'to see the premier and take such further steps as he thinks advisable'.³ The outcome was that the trustees were duly appointed.

The three existing trustees were Murchison himself, the banker, James McLaughlin, a solicitor, and Morkham. All three were devotees of the club. The majority of the new appointees were almost unanimously politically and socially opposed to the Melbourne CC. Of these, John Murray and J.E.Mackey were actually in the Bent government. Murray was a Presbyterian grazier and was later to become the premier of the state. He was a radical liberal and a detester of plutocracy. From 1904 to

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 13 Mar. 1896. Morkham's military rank was a result of service in the Volunteers.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 8 Nov. 1905.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 28 Nov. 1905.

August 1906 he was president of the Board of Land and Works, as well as being commissioner of Crown Lands and Survey. On 15 August, immediately following the crisis at the Melbourne CC he resigned over the issue of compulsory land purchase, a policy that Bent opposed but Murray supported. He was also interested in sport, especially trotting and cricket. Mackey was another Presbyterian who had, apparently, worked his way up from poverty to politics. He is described in the *A.D.B.*, as having been 'rough in manners and appearance'. Although self-educated he got into Melbourne University where he studied at Ormond College, which immediately put him into the social milieu of the Melbourne CC. He was not as radical as Murray, but he was still a reformer who served the Bent government as Minister-without-Portfolio until he succeeded Murray in the Lands Department in August 1906.

Another two of the newly appointed trustees were from remarkably similar backgrounds to Murray and Mackey. Sir Alexander Peacock was a liberal with radical leanings who had risen from a humble background to high office. Like many politicians of his time he had served his political apprenticeship in the Australian Natives' Association (ANA) and had led the liberals until 1904, when he handed over to Donald Mackinnon. William Watt was also a member of the Legislative Assembly and likewise had lowly origins, being educated in the working-class suburb of North Melbourne. He had also served some time in the ANA. He was, like the others, a Presbyterian liberal. He also had connections with the North Melbourne CC. Of the final new appointments to the Trust James Skene, in his capacity as Secretary for the Lands Department, may well have been ideologically allied with the above. This was not the case with the final appointee. George Fairbairn was of a very different background to his liberal colleagues, although a Member of the Legislative Assembly. He was from the established squattocracy and was related to the Armytage family. He was educated at Geelong Grammar School, a far cry from the state schools of the others. He then spent two years at Jesus College, Cambridge. He was an ardent philathlete and was instrumental in founding the Henley-on-Yarra regatta in 1903. He was also the first president of the Melbourne Amateur Athletics and Rowing clubs, and had already served two terms as president of the Melbourne Club. He was a pastoralist and a director of a multitude of different companies.

Unlike the defeat of the Sydney trustees, the downfall of the Melbourne CC has a hint of political and class conflict. E.D.Heather, secretary of the VCA,¹ had written to

¹ To demonstrate how complex the alliances were during the dispute, it should be noted that Heather was actually a stalwart of the South Melbourne CC, which was one of the two association clubs to support the Melbourne CC. Nevertheless, Heather had been a longtime member of the VCA, as well as a constant opponent of the Melbourne CC, and this was where his own personal loyalties lay. He had been unable to persuade his club that they should fall in with the Association.

the new chairman of the Trust, J.E.Mackey, asking for the use of the ground for interstate contests, as well as requesting 'that in the event of a representative English team visiting the Commonwealth during the season, under the auspices, and in response to the invitation of the Australian Board of control, your trustees will likewise reserve dates for the two test matches and for two matches Victoria v. England'. Mackey replied that he was 'authorised' to comply with this request.¹ This was an open challenge to the Melbourne CC, questioning their right to run the ground. In previous years requests of this nature had been made by the VCA directly to the club committee. Now the VCA had gone straight over their heads to the new trustees, who appeared to be sympathetic to the Association. Indeed, it seems highly likely that there had been some collusion between Mackey and Heather upon this course of action as a means of securing a victory in the dispute.

The Melbourne CC was stunned by the action of the VCA and trustees. They had, however, been aware that such action was possible. On 4 June, *The Sydney Morning Herald* had announced that 'it is said that someone has discovered a flaw in the Melbourne cricket club's title to the ground deed',² while on 7 June *The Bulletin* announced more forthrightly that 'Premier Bent had heaved a bombshell into the cricket dispute'. It went on to detail the appointment of the new trustees and the flaw in the deeds which meant that the trustees, and not the cricket club, were the controllers of the ground. Amused by this *The Bulletin* went on:

So the Melbourne Cricket Club may presently find itself a mere push on a street corner, without a ground, or club room, or grand stand, or bowling green, or anything. If, frinstans [sic], these six - a majority of the existing nine trustees - choose to let their ground and buildings to, say, the VCA to play inter-state or international matches, they are legally entitled to do so.³

That this eventuality had occurred to the committee is shown by an entry into the *Minutes* of 21 June, which suggests that they had sought and received reassurance from the trustees that this scenario would not occur:

The majority of the trustees stated that they had no intention of injuring the Melbourne Cricket Club and that no steps would be taken of any importance without the club being heard. Mr.Mitchell was instructed to inform as many members of the club as possible to this effect.⁴

1 *Argus*, (26 June 1906). Pasted into the Minutes of that date.

2 *Sydney Morning Herald*, (4 June 1906), p.8.

3 *The Bulletin*, (7 June 1906), p.24.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 21 June 1906.

The fact that it was a majority and not unanimous indicates that some either had misgivings, or had not made their opinion known. Nevertheless, the committee, at least, seemed reassured.

The reaction to the exchange of letters between Mackey and Heather was most forcefully expressed by E.F. Mitchell, who had been chief negotiator with the trustees. The *Argus* reported that on being shown the correspondence he 'expressed at first incredulity, and then indignation'. He then 'stated that he had heard rumours of some such action during the afternoon, and refused to believe them' due to his conversation with the trustees of 21 July. Mackey claimed to the press that he had acted upon the authority of a majority of the trustees. This was a slightly disingenuous remark as he had not been able to consult Murchison. Likewise, Fairbairn had told him 'that he declined to give his views unless there was a meeting of the trustees'. Fairbairn had, however, made it quite clear to Mackey that his sympathy lay with the club, saying that it 'had done the business of the ground well in the past' and that he saw no reason 'why the club should be interfered with at this stage'.¹ The majority of the trustees actually consisted of Mackey, Murray, Peacock, Watt and Skene. As seen, this was a politically and socially homogeneous group, while Fairbairn, the one dissenter from the new batch of trustees was aligned with the Melbourne CC.

There was an amount of political manipulation based on class antagonisms in this affair. All those on the trust, inclusive of Melbourne CC committee members, were from the governing class, but they were not as a group, politically or socially united. The radical liberals who had worked their way up the social structure seemed intent upon undermining the socially prestigious and relatively exclusive Melbourne CC. These feelings of antagonism seem to have been confirmed by Murray, whose statement on the issue is revealing:

The proper title of the ground...is the Metropolitan Cricket Ground. It was reserved for recreation, and was specially dedicated to cricket. In England, the commons of the country had often been fenced in and appropriated by the nobility, and in a similar manner a wealthy cricket club had usurped the functions of the trustees, in whom the ground had been vested.²

1 All preceding quotes on the actions of the 25 June 1906 taken from *Argus*, 26 June, and pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC* of that date.

2 *Age*, (28 June 1906), p.10.

This is an explicit political statement that likens the Melbourne CC to the exclusive and exploitative aristocracy of Britain. It seems, therefore, that the majority of the trustees believed that the Melbourne CC was the enemy, possibly even the class enemy.¹

The club's position in the dispute, already weakening, was now at its lowest ebb. Efforts were already under way to compromise and integrate the VCL with the VCA. SACA had backed down having gained most of what it wanted, an action that on the 28 June prompted the club to say it 'was astonished' at this development.² There was nowhere for it to go but to attempt to come out of the dispute with some of its status and, more importantly, power intact. It was also necessary to salvage some control over the ground, and the spectre of the relationship between the NSWCA and the SCG Trustees must have been lurking at the back of the mind of the committee. The following years were to see the club excluded from district competition and a weak voice on the VCA, although it had the support of South Melbourne, Richmond and other League clubs. All it managed to salvage was a place on the Board of Control and a *modus vivendi* with the trust. The former was frequently questioned, because it was not granted directly, but was merely the result of indirect appointment through the *largesse* of the VCA. The latter was thrashed out in the following months and an agreement was reached in February 1907 that heavily favoured the trustees,³ prompting one anguished member of the Melbourne CC to write to *The Argus* saying:

So we have the extraordinarily anomalous position of a club consisting of 4,500 members, whose business is to be managed by a body of men in whose appointment they have no voice, and to whose decrees they are bound to submit.⁴

To what extent then, were the actions of the trustees political? Was the involvement of Bent's men the result of the political climate? Why had politicians interfered in the dispute? The actions of the trustees do appear to be very much in tune with the actions of the Bent Ministry. Although Bent himself was a conservative and a land-speculator, the ministry itself, in keeping with the political complexion of post-federal Australia, was radical in essence, a factor indicated by the involvement of

1 Many of the Melbourne papers believed that the action of the trustees had been political. *Leader*, (30 June 1906), p.21, commented that 'A political majority has been created, and this majority is being used for purposes which were never in contemplation when the crown grant for the land was originally vested in trustees'. *Australasian*, (30 June 1906), p.1519, felt the same way. It accused Mackey of 'partisanship' and said that 'the suggestion of pre-arrangement cannot be ignored'.

2 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 28 June 1906.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 19 Feb. 1907.

4 *Argus*, (14 Feb. 1907), pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 19 Feb. 1907.

Mackey and Murray in the trusteeship.¹ It also has to be remembered that at this time land was once again a political issue and the Bent government was committed to a policy of closer land settlement. However, there was a clash within the Ministry over this issue between John Murray and the radicals, who were in favour of compulsory purchase for redistribution of unused or under-utilised land by the government, and Bent, who desired closer settlement but was not in favour of compulsory purchase. It was this issue that led Murray to resign in August. Notably, in this battle, one of Murray's chief allies was fellow trustee William Watt.² Part of the battle between those for and against compulsory purchase involved the great landowning interests, the conservative squatter group. Bent felt that he could not risk alienating this group. Murray felt differently, seeing the squatters as an entrenched interest against whom it was necessary to fight. It might appear tendentious to link this particular issue with that of the Melbourne Cricket Ground Trust, but given Murray's attitudes to land and class, the attack seems entirely in character with the other land issues.

Bent himself may not have been in favour of the action taken by the trust. Earlier in the year he had laid the foundation stone for a new pavilion at the MCG and had made some very telling remarks. Apart from the rather obvious statements usually made at these functions about the importance of cricket and its character-building potential, a

1 For the career of Bent, see *A.D.B.*, Vol.3, p.144-6. Bent was an extraordinary character. Iconoclastic and crooked, these characteristics lead to his nick-name 'Honest Tom'. Following the crash he was politically discredited in the mid-90s due to his land dealings and the use he had made of his parliamentary connections and influence to gain profits etc. through land speculation. Remarkably, he was able to make a political come-back in 1900 with the slogan 'Bent Never Beaten', and from there he was eventually able to form his ministry in 1904. Cannon notes that 'an older and wiser Bent introduced many progressive measures...' although it seems that he was still attracted to using his political power for personal gain. Eventually following Murray's attempts to discredit him and his land policy he was removed from political office and a Royal Commission investigated his dealings. See M.Cannon, *The Landboomers*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1966), pp.177-88.

2 See *A.D.B.*, Vol.10, pp.644-5 for Murray's career and the battles over land etc. Land was a complex issue in Australian history. There were many demands for the land to be 'unlocked' to allow greater settlement. This involved curbing the power of the squatters. Over the years, there had been various sets of legislation to attempt to achieve this end, particularly in the 1860s and 1880s. By the turn of the century most state governments believed that closer settlement would aid Australia's need to develop agricultural land. There was also an element of attempting to fill up the 'empty spaces', as there was a sense in which many felt that 'if white Australia did not fill up "the wide brown land" some other races would soon do so, evidently echoing the sentiment of president Theodore Roosevelt of the USA that "an unmanned nation invites disaster"', F. Crowley, *A New History of Australia*, (Heinemann, Melbourne 1974), pp.297-9. Also see Kingston, *Oxford History of Australia*, Vol.3, pp.258-70; S.Macintyre, *Winners and Losers. The Pursuit of Social Justice in Australian History*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney 1988), pp.19-39. Significantly, Macintyre says that following the land acts of the 60s 'the squatter and the businessman had closed the agrarian path to social justice, and a yawning gap had been revealed between declaration of noble intent and ignoble reality' (p.38). Presumably Murray was pursuing the goal of social justice both in the important sphere of compulsory purchase of land and the less important area of Victorian cricket.

lot of his speech was aimed against the gambling fraternity, or more specifically, the bookmakers.¹ But more importantly for this particular issue he had at one instance commented:

He hoped that before long the government would see fit - because it had been rather sparing in this direction - he hoped it would see its way to increase the area of this land.²

Bent was certainly a politician who possessed a glib forked-tongue, nevertheless, it is likely that he himself meant no harm to the Melbourne CC. But the more immediate future of the club was controlled by the Lands Department which within the broad coalition of Bent's ministry had radical leanings. Due to the nature of the dispute between Bent and Murray it seems unlikely that the former would interfere on behalf of the Cricket Club.

The conflict was therefore resolved by political action. The dispute that had originated as a question of who should hold the most power in Victorian and Australian cricket became caught up in the dispute over control of the land. The cricket issue had been caused not by a clash of ideologies, but by a desire for different sections of the cricketing community to be sole controller of an ideology. Support for each institution had not been based on over-arching ideals, but upon day-to-day loyalties far-removed from the wider spheres of intercolonial, national or even international loyalties. In Sydney, the dispute had been settled partially by actions against the trust, but victory could not be claimed until the Melbourne CC was defeated in Victoria. This defeat was achieved through political action that may well have been motivated by a degree of class conflict, or rather conflict between different groups within the structure of power. The key figure in this was the radical John Murray, who nevertheless was a keen supporter of cricket and may well have felt that his actions, while radical in tone, were merely a solution to what seemed an impasse.

IV

The Melbourne CC in the wilderness. The 1912 dispute and the scheme to organise country cricket

There was one group who opposed the Board who were yet to be compromised or beaten. These were the players whose time was to come in 1912. The Board, while

¹ *Leader*, (17 Feb. 1906), p.17. Bent's comments become much more understandable when it is considered that at this time the battle between John Wren, the Collingwood bookmaker, and the government and police was in full swing. Bent said, not entirely truthfully given that the MCG had been the home to the Austral cycle race, 'This ground had given pleasure to thousands and was supporting an institution where betting had no part'. The issues over betting were very complex and involved a great deal of corruption and hypocrisy.

² *Leader*, (17 Feb. 1906), p.17.

not agreeing to player representation, had agreed to leave the financial arrangements of the Australian XI untouched, although it did demand a degree of supervision. The 1912 dispute was an adjunct of 1906, although it concerned the players rights to choose their own manager. In reality it was about who had control of the team, players or Board, and the Board inevitably won.

The VCA actually believed that the Melbourne CC were behind the dispute and that it was a surreptitious attempt by the club to wrest control from the Board, a view that was forthrightly expressed in a pamphlet published at the height of the dispute.¹ The pamphlet detailed the club's involvement in cricket over the years, accusing it of financial motivation and greed, as well as effecting the demise of the ACC. The pamphlet pulled no punches commenting that after the decline of the council:

The management of the game once more descended into the shady regions of cliquism, and favouritism, where it wallowed until the year 1905, when, in the interest of true and pure sport, and in order to put a stop to the abuses indicated, and to give all deserving players equal opportunities of getting into big cricket, the VCA proposed to support the establishment of a Board of Control, that should wrest the government of international cricket from the hands of men who had unequivocally shown that their chief and almost their only desire was individual aggrandisement.²

This was pointed and strong stuff. All the old accusations were wheeled out, suggesting that the players were merely professionals who selected teams and went to England for the sole purpose of making money, while leaving behind other cricketers who was as good, but could not afford a share. The Melbourne CC were accused of greed and fully backing and, perhaps, instigating the revolt of the players. The pamphlet emphasised that the club was the *eminence grise* of the dispute by wholeheartedly supporting the stand that had been taken by Trumper, Hill, Cotter, Carter, Armstrong and Ransford. It also contained a report of a VCA meeting held in January where both the players and the Melbourne CC were mauled by various delegates and defended by the Melbourne CC committee members on the Association.³ Notably, condemnation of the players and support for the Board was given by all but Aitken and Mailer, the club's delegates. The pamphlet concluded with a section which had an unconsciously humorous title: 'Extracts from the unbiased sections of Australian press'. This consisted in the main of articles from papers like the *Gippsland Standard*,

1 Anon., *Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association*, (City Press Print, Melbourne, 1912).

2 Anon., *Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association*, pp. 2-3.

3 Anon., *Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association*, pp.9-16.

the *Hobart Mercury* and the Sydney papers, which continued their unremitting stance in favour of the Board and against the players.¹

The Melbourne CC was sympathetic to the players, not least because Armstrong and Ransford, two of the most prominent rebels, were important cricketers within the club. Equally, the club appears to have been loyal to those who had supported it in 1906. Nevertheless, its actions in the dispute were muted and the *Minutes* remain remarkably reticent about the whole matter, suggesting relative inaction. Its reactions to the pamphlet were slow, almost dignified. It did not produce a reply to the VCA accusations until August, almost 4 months after they had originally been made by which time the Australian team were nearing the end of their tour to England and the issue was effectively dead. The club denied that it was hostile to the Board and countered accusations about the club's and the player's greed one by one.²

The Board and the Associations had provoked this final show-down to break the power of the players. In this they succeeded. But accusations by the VCA about Melbourne CC involvement in the dispute were misdirected and ill-founded, as the club had been well and truly defeated in the previous dispute. In reality, from 1906, the club had to content itself with a lesser role in Victoria, sitting on the VCA, defending the interests of the former League clubs, providing a single member to sit on the Board of control, hosting big matches under the auspices of the Association and attempting to develop country cricket. It was with the last of these vestiges of power, country cricket, that the Melbourne CC attempted to carve out a new niche for itself and retain an atom of its former influence and glory. In September 1906 it had been decided that the club

1 Anon., *Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association*, pp. 19-24. The final 'unbiased' quote blatantly accused the Melbourne CC, with the players, of greed and calumny. It was a satirical piece pretending to be written by J.H.Fake, a Melbourne committee-man organising a subscription list for an 'unauthorised cricket team'. The subscriptions noted were from J.H.Fake, W.Takedown, H.R.Nark, John T.Shifter, A.B.Smoodger, and L.R.Simpleton. The basis for this satire was a Melbourne based Citizen's Committee which at a meeting in Melbourne Town Hall had suggested such a list to send an unofficial team to England. Several members of the committee were prominent Melbourne CC men, including Norman Brooks, William Bruce and J.W.Trumble (the brother of Hugh Trumble the new secretary of the Melbourne CC). See Anon., *Statement of the Citizen's Cricket Committee*, (n.p., Melbourne 1912).

2 Anon., *Reply by the Melbourne Cricket Club to the "Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association"*, (Melbourne CC, Melbourne 1912). The pamphlet stated that the delay in publication was 'lest the exposures of the pamphlet might be detrimental to the prospects of the Australian Eleven now playing in England' (p.5). The pamphlet defended the corner of both players and the club, stating that on the one hand that there could be 'no hesitation in denouncing as an unpatriotic calumny the assertion that the leading members of Australian Elevens before 1905 cared for nothing but making money...' (p.8), while on the other it said that it had no objections to the Board as an institution, but that it wanted to see the Board behave in a more reasonable manner and consisting of men 'in whose judgement and impartiality playing cricketers have confidence' (p.25).

would draw up a plan to foster and develop cricket in the country districts of Victoria.¹ By June the following year plans were far enough advanced for a conference to be held, hosted by the Melbourne CC and attended by country cricket delegates and a few representatives from the VCA. That the scheme was an attempt to create a new constituency for the club was apparent in the statement of club president Sir Leo Cussens, who said 'that this scheme was not put forward in any spirit of antagonism to the VCA', while the VCA were determined that the scheme should be submitted to it for approval.² The scheme proved difficult to initiate, but the motives of the Melbourne CC were made even clearer when Cussens's stated at the AGM of 1907 that 'the MCC was more than a cricket club, in the sense of playing cricket itself, and the committee had felt that they had to act to some extent in the interests of public cricket'.³ Unfortunately, by the following year the committee could only report that 'little progress has been made in the scheme' and this was very much the way matters remained.⁴ It is apparent that the club's lack of power was symbolised by this shift from metropolitan, national and international interests, to the peripheral - the parochial interests of country cricket within one state.

1 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 14 Sept. 1906. The actual wording of the resolution was that the committee thought that 'the best interests of the MCC are served by assisting the development of as much high class cricket as possible throughout Victoria'. The timing of this statement indicates the extent to which the club believed that it had to find a new role for itself with its final defeat in the dispute.

2 Conference was reported in *Age*, 22 June (1907) and this was pasted into the *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 21 June 1907.

3 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 Sept. 1907.

4 *Minutes of Melbourne CC*, 12 Sept. 1908.

The study of cricket might be said to be in its infancy despite the continuous outpourings from cricket writers of varying qualities. Most of these people would probably be startled by the nature of the exercise that has just been completed. Their history is a completely different history because, with few exceptions, they write from within to uphold the traditions and mythologies of the game. By so doing they take part in the invention of cricket's past and they uphold the views of men like Lord Hawke. They also insist upon a 'neutral' non-political interpretation of the game. This is surely a contradiction in terms, for Hawke saw that cricket had a political purpose. Likewise, when an ex-cabinet minister announces that Asian immigrants should take a cricket test to determine whether their loyalties are to England or the country of their birth, we are still asked to believe that politics/life should not incur on the field of play.¹ Of course, what Tebbit and his ilk mean is that politics should intrude only when it is their own political ideology; the way of seeing things that upholds the Establishment or established order. There have been notable exceptions to this, including John Arlott and the late C.L.R. James.² Nevertheless, a radical critique of the sport is rarely welcomed. Perhaps this is because of the paradox that is involved in examining the game from this particular stance. A personal example will suffice to illustrate the point. As an historian one might have a perspective on society and the way that society functions that is critical of the way that that society is organised and the way resources are distributed within it. At the same time one will be naturally critical of an ideology that contradicts such criticisms (which the ideology of cricket undoubtedly does). As an individual, however, one might be an ardent cricketer who plays every weekend during the season, reads about the game and even upholds the specific ideology on the field. This creates a love/hate relationship with the game, or at least severe tensions that are sometimes hard to resolve. However, this is merely acknowledging the difficulties that any historical writer brings to his/her work, but for all that it is not irrelevant. Perhaps it would be productive for those that approach the game to recognise that such problems will always be apparent.

The theoretical point of this thesis has been to show that cricket had a social and cultural importance within the societies of Britain and Australia. This, in itself, is enough to make the study of cricket important for historians, particularly those who want to understand class formation and ideology in both countries. What is

1 It is highly likely that Norman Tebbit would be very critical of this exercise as well. Of all the political parties the Conservatives have the most among their ranks who see sport's place outside of politics.

2 John Arlott's mild social criticisms are forgivable, not least because his broad rural dialect, that speaks of an age gone by, is perfectly in tune with the ideology of cricket. As for James, he too could be forgiven because he was, in many ways, a traditionalist when it came to commenting on the game.

extraordinary is the number of historians who have studied British society and have completely excluded the game from their analysis. Perhaps the most glaring example of this is Martin J. Wiener in his controversial book *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit*.¹ This is not the place to launch into a detailed critique of Wiener's thesis, although it is necessary to sketch his ideas out. Wiener believes that the roots of the 'British' disease (i.e. low growth, low investment in industry and the industrial decline that results from these two factors) lie in specific historical developments which relate to class, class formation and ideology. During the latter half of the nineteenth century when the aristocracy, landed gentry, industrial and business classes were drawing together, the ideology that became dominant was that of the old landed élite. The major feature that this stressed was an overwhelming anti-industrialism combined with a rural idyll that emphasised the pre-industrial qualities of an ordered society shaped like a pyramid with social relationships set within the pattern of a neo-feudal deference. It harked back to a rural (Southern) England that was in total opposition to the nature of Victorian industrial society. It derided the making of money and acted as a damning critique of industrial order. It was propagated through the public school system which was the agency of accommodation/incorporation between the emergent fractions of the new ruling class.² It was influenced and strengthened by the writings of the intelligentsia.³ It became all-embracing within a dominant English culture. Thus, this pervasive anti-industrialism drew the upper classes away from industrial society to pursuits of some sort or other (often finance). It also prevented them from investing their money in industry. The reason for decline is therefore located in an ideology that saps the entrepreneurial spirit of the nation. There are many levels on which Wiener can be criticised. His evidence is mostly qualitative. He does not seem to go in for any sort of economic examination and therefore ignores important questions of investment patterns and imperialism. More specifically his charges against the public schools do not stand up under detailed empirical analysis.⁴ Moreover the book is written to uphold what was then the current economic dogma of the right. From

1 M.J. Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, (Pelican, London 1985).

2 Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, pp. 16-24.

3 Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, pp. 30-40. It is hard to understand whether Wiener believes that the likes of Dickens, Mill, Arnold, Ruskin and Morris were the ideologues of this new anti-industrialism or merely the scribes.

4 See H. Berghoff, 'Public Schools and the Decline of the British Economy 1870-1914', *Past and Present*, no. 129, (November 1990), esp. pp. 156; 166-7. In a study of over 1000 entrepreneurs Berghoff discovered that 18% were educated at public schools. Therefore he says that the 'relevance of public schools for a study of the late nineteenth-century business community has been gravely exaggerated' (p. 156).

the point of view of this thesis the most extraordinary thing is the almost total blank (amnesia would be too kind a diagnosis) on sport and particularly cricket, which was if anything the embodiment of the ideology of which Wiener is so critical. Instead he dwells at some length on architecture 'the myth made tangible'.¹ This is an extraordinary lapse from an historian who is purportedly knowledgeable on the workings of an ideology that is embodied in the game of cricket as nowhere else. This thesis is, to an extent, a corrective to this sort of neglect, although it would baulk at blaming the ideology that is mapped out by Wiener (and by association the ideology of cricket as well) for Britain's industrial decline.²

This thesis has also demonstrated that the ideology of cricket, which stressed such things as class-conciliation and fair play, was at the most only partially hegemonic. However, the game was used more specifically by members of the dominant class to secure or challenge cohesion among its own cohorts. It was therefore part of the creation and maintenance of the class structure through a process of accommodation and demarcation, along with many other different phenomena. Thus, the first club, the Marylebone, became one of the foci for the London Season, making membership a socially prestigious badge, strengthening its claims to control cricket. The second, the Melbourne, used cricket to establish its predominance as a social institution within Victoria and Australia. Both clubs 'invent' their own traditions. They build up mythologies that are designed to reinforce their position within the organisational structure of cricket. These traditions operate within the confines of the ideology of cricket. To an extent, they are also based upon the social composition of the membership. Neither club is overly interested in the ideology of cricket functioning as a weapon of hegemony over a subordinate class. They are more interested in gaining paramount position within their own class. In the case of Marylebone, the traditions were founded on a degree of reality. They were able to use these traditions, as well as their own social background, to take over the running of cricket. In the case of the Melbourne CC, matters were more complex. The social structure of Australia was more fluid and the dominant class more fragmented. They faced challenges from other organisations from similar class backgrounds who felt that they had an equal right to

1 Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, pp. 64-72.

2 It must be noted that other works on such matters as English nationalism have excluded sport for a variety of reasons. An example of this is R.Colls, P.Dodds (eds.), *Englishness. Politics and Culture 1880-1920*, (Croom Helm, London 1986). In this instance sport is purposefully left out of the volume because it had been studied previously in *The Invention of Tradition* (see the preface to *Englishness*). This seems quite unfair, not least because Alun Howkins' chapter on 'The Discovery of Rural England' might have benefited from an examination of cricket and the rural idyll. Instead, following in the footsteps of Wiener, Howkins concentrates on aspects like architecture. As has been shown in chapters 1 and 5 of this thesis, works on Australia have mentioned sport in a far more comprehensive manner.

control cricket. In the end, however, it is possible to see that the traditions that the Marylebone CC deployed were more successful and became more complete. Although the position of the Marylebone CC was challenged at the beginning of the period it had the social resources to fight the challenge, and then become a central focus for English cricket. The Melbourne CC on the other hand continually faced contest. Their traditions were only accepted by a few groups within dominant class society at large. They were therefore unable to act as a focus in the same way, although they attempted to do so. This explains why there were so many problems in establishing a centralised organisation in Australia.

This thesis shows that cricket could have different meanings for different people. The Australian meaning is specifically different to the English meaning. Sections of the subordinate class might find completely different meanings or no meanings at all. This is perhaps the result of the cultural nature of cricket. If we are to take the definition of culture that was propounded by Clifford Geertz as being a set of rituals and practices designed to tell ourselves something about ourselves, then it is possible to see why a game like cricket had the ability to be adaptable within different cultures.¹ The game could be re-invented by groups to serve their own cultural purposes. It is this that enables Ashis Nandy to claim that cricket is an Indian game that was accidentally invented by the English.² As it is the meanings that the Melbourne CC imposed on cricket were distinctly similar to the Marylebone interpretation. Nevertheless, as is

1 C. Geertz, 'Deep Play: Notes on a Balinese Cockfight', *Daedalus*, Vol.101, no.1 (1972). This article examines a phenomenon that Geertz describes as 'Deep Play', a concept taken from Bentham, which indicates a kind of play where the stakes are so high that it is, from a utilitarian point of view, irrational for men to engage in it at all (p.15). In the Balinese cockfight it is possible for a protagonist to lose a fortune through one fight. The fight itself involves all manner of status and kinship considerations. But most importantly what the cockfight reveals is the core of Balinese culture, 'its function is interpretive...it is a Balinese reading of Balinese experience; a story they tell themselves about themselves' (p.23). It would be possible for an anthropologist to study cricket from this standpoint, and it is possible to assert that cricket was a story that the English and Australian dominant classes tell themselves about themselves.

2 Nandy, *The Tao of Cricket*, p.1: 'Cricket is an Indian game accidentally discovered by the English. Like chilli, which was discovered in South America and came to India only in medieval times to become part of Indian cuisine, cricket, too, is now foreign to India only according to the historians and the Indologists. To most Indians the game now looks more Indian than English. They find it only natural that cricket today arouses more passions in India than in England'. He then goes on to show how India has adapted cricket to its own cultural ends demonstrating, for example, how the arena of cricket was adaptable to the concept of *asura*. *Asuras* are anti-gods who ensure that the game (any game) can go on. They are worthy enemies who play within the moral framework of the game and are an integral part of the game. Opponents do however have the potential to become *rakshasas*, anti-gods who seek to destroy the moral order of the game. Such a *rakshasa* was West Indian fast bowler Charlie Griffith who felled Nari Contractor in 1962 with a bouncer. Few Indians wished that Griffith played for India; he demoted himself to the status of *rakshasa*' (p.47). Nandy demonstrates that another area where these two types of villain exist is the realm of Indian popular film.

implicit in the thesis, the game could take on specific usages in the Melburnian context that would have been unthought of in England.

Finally, it is necessary to point out directions that the combined study of cricket and history might take in the future. This thesis is one of the first examinations of the role of clubs within cricket. But as will be recognised the clubs examined are not particularly typical. Nevertheless, an understanding of the role of the club in sport must be important in any future studies. Clubs are central social institutions in the framework of sport and they function both as a producer of sport and also as a forum for conviviality. This, however, should not blind us to their social significance. For conviviality is only one step away from producing various forms of social cohesion and perhaps even consciousness of an agent's position within the social structure in relation to other agents. Until now the main producers of sport and sporting ideology that have been examined have been educational institutions. As important as these places are it is also necessary to look in more detail at the role of voluntary associations (in the broadest sense), for here is the nexus of sporting relationships. At the same time one must also be aware of the intensely political nature of sport. Countries play countries and nationalism takes a seat at the games. The state now plays a role directly, through organisations charged with developing sports, and thus political policy can shape the way that sport is played and the facilities that are provided for it. Political boycotts of nations are organised if other countries feel that the behaviour of any particular country is unsavoury. Even at the local level the relationship between sporting clubs and councils can take a political dimension. Equally, the formation of groups like the Football Supporters Association¹ acts as a political pressure group. Clubs obviously have an important role to play in this particular framework.

The genesis of the structure of sport occurred in the Victorian and Edwardian era and it was here that sport developed the potential to become a truly social and political structure, as well as an industry in its own right. At this time the major developments in the sporting world occurred and the sporting world of today began to take shape. But that world has slowly dissolved, a new world is taking shape, the process of synthesis that is the driving force of human social relations continues apace. In the near future it will be even more necessary to examine contemporary cricket from a social and political angle than has been done before. It is true that C.L.R. James started the task with *Beyond a Boundary*. This task has been continued in Derek Birley's *Willow Wand*,

¹ Formed in the second half of the 1980s as a response to the troubles that have afflicted British football (especially English football) including: the tragedies of Bradford and Heysel; persistent hooliganism; and appalling (mis)management by football clubs. All of this has led many football supporters to become alienated from the game.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Archival and Manuscript

Marylebone CC Minutes, 1860-1914, 3 Volumes, Available on request from the Marylebone CC Library at Lord's cricket ground.

Marylebone CC Membership Lists. Available as above.

Melbourne CC Minutes, 1860-1914, 22 Volumes, Available on request from the Melbourne CC Library at the Melbourne Cricket Ground. There were 2 missing Volumes: 1881-82; 1899-1901.

Melbourne Amateur Athletics and Sports Club Minutes, Available from the Melbourne CC library, as above.

Correspondence to F.S.Ashley-Cooper and the Marylebone CC. Available from the Library at Lord's.

Correspondence of Lord Harris in the Harris Collection in the India Office Library: Harris to Lord Wenlock, Mss.Eur.592/12; Harris to Marquess Of Lansdowne, Mss.Eur.256/5/7; Marquess of Lansdowne to Harris, Mss.Eur.256/6/8; Harris to Lord Cross, Mss.Eur.256/1; Lord Cross to Harris, Mss.Eur.256/2.

Printed Primary Sources

Books

'A Cantab' (ed.), *Lillywhite's Handbook of Cricket 1844*, (Ackerman, London 1844).

Allen, D.Rayvern, *Cricket's Silver Linings, 1864-1914*, (Collins, London 1987).

Anon., *Cricket: Shaw and Shrewsbury's Team in Australia, 1884-85*, (Nottingham, Shaw and Shrewsbury 1885).

Anon., *John Lillywhite's Cricket Companion for 1881*, (Lillywhite's, London 1881).

Anon., *The Cricketer's Register, 1863-1864*, (Sands and McDougall, Melbourne, 1864).

'Argus' (P.E.Reynolds), *The Australian Cricketers Tour through Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain*, (J.W.McKenzie reprint, Epsom 1978 - 1st edn. 1878).

Ashley-Cooper, F.S., *Stoddart's Team in Australia, 1897-1898*, (Cricket Publications, London 1898).

Ashley-Cooper, F.S (ed.), *James Love: Cricket - An Heroic Poem*, (Charles Richards, Nottingham, 1922, poem originally published in 1744).

Bartley, N., *Opals and Agates; Or Scenes Under the Southern Cross and the Magellans*, (Gordon and Gotch, Brisbane 1892).

Bateman, J., *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland*, (Harrison and Sons, London 1883).

Beeston, R.D., *St. Ivo and the Ashes*, (Australian Press Agency, Melbourne 1883).

- Bettesworth, W.A., *Chats on the Cricket Field*, (Merrit and Hatcher, London n.d.).
- Bettesworth, W.A., *The Walker's Of Southgate*, (Methuen, London 1900).
- Bowen, C.P., *English Cricketers In The West Indies*, (The Herald Office, Bridgetown Barbados 1896).
- Box, C., *Musings for Athletes*, (Simpleton, Marshall, London 1888).
- Box, C., *The English Game of Cricket*, (The Field, London 1877).
- Boyle, H.F. & Scott, D. (eds.), *The Australian Cricketers' Guide*, (Boyle & Scott, Melbourne, 1879-80, 1883-84).
- British Empire League, *The British Empire Series*, (5 Vols.), (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London 1899-1902).
- Buckley, G.B., *Fresh Light on Pre-Victorian Cricket*, (Cotterel, Birmingham 1937).
- 'Catch-A-Catch', *Comical Cricket in Rhyme and Picture*, (Marshall, Melbourne, 1891).
- Clarke, A.E., *The East Melbourne Cricket Club. Its History, 1860-1910*, (George Robertson, Melbourne 1910).
- Coke, D., *The Bending Of A Twig*, (Oxford University Press, London 1920, 1st edn. 1906).
- Conway, J., *Conway's Australian Cricketers' Annual, 1876-77*, (Baillière, Melbourne 1878).
- Conway, J., *Conway's Australian Cricketer's Annual, 1877-1878*, (Baillière, Melbourne 1877).
- Crawford, J.N., *Trip to 'Kangaroo' Land*, (Cricket offices 1909).
- Daft, R., *King's of Cricket*, (J.W.Arrowsmith, Bristol 1893).
- Dilke, C.W., *Greater Britain. A Record of Travel in English Speaking Countries During 1866 and 1867*, (2 Vols.), (Macmillan, London 1868).
- Drummond, Prof.H., *Baxter's Second Innings. Specially Reported For The School Eleven*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1892).
- Duff, G., *At The Nets...Or Lessons From Cricket*, (J.W.Butcher, London 1910).
- Fairfax, W., *The Cricketers' Guide for Australasia*, (W.Fairfax, Melbourne 1858).
- Fitzgerald, R.A., *Wickets in the West*, (Tinsley Brothers, London 1873).
- Froude, J.A., *Oceana or England and Her Colonies*, (Longmans, Green, London 1886).
- Furse, R., *Aucuparius. Recollections Of A Recruiting Officer*, (Oxford University Press, London 1962).

- Gale, F., *Echoes from Old Cricket Fields*, (David Nutt, London 1896).
- Gale, F., *Memoir of the Hon. Robert Grimston*, (Longmans, Green, London 1885).
- Gale, F., *Modern English Sports: Their Use and Their Abuse*, (Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London 1885).
- Gale, F., *Sport and Recreation in Town and Country*, (Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey, London 1888).
- Gale, F., *The Battle For Lord's*, (Unpublished, available in the library at Lord's 1891).
- Gale, F., *The Game of Cricket*, (Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey, London 1887).
- Gale, N., *Cricket Songs*, (Methuen, London 1894).
- Gale, N., *More Cricket Songs*, (Alston Rivers, London 1905).
- 'Garryowen' (E.Finn), *The Chronicles of Early Melbourne, 1835-1855, (Centennial Edition)*, (Ferguson and Mitchell, Melbourne 1888).
- Giffen, G., *With Bat and Ball: 25 Years Reminiscences of Australia and Anglo-Australian Cricket*, (Ward, Lock, London 1898).
- Green, B. (ed.), *Wisden Anthology 1900-1940*, (Queen Anne Press, London 1980).
- Green, B. (ed.), *The Wisden Book Of Obituaries, 1892-1985*, (Macdonald Queen Anne Press, London 1986).
- Guggisberg, D.M. & F.G., *We Two in West Africa*, (Heinemann, London 1909).
- Guggisberg, F.G. & Fraser, A.G., *The Future of the Negro*, (Student Christian Movement, London 1924).
- Hammond, W.R., *Cricket's Secret History*, (Stanley Paul, London 1952).
- Harris, Lord, *A Few Short Runs*, (Murray, London 1921).
- Harris, Lord & Ashley-Cooper, F.S., *Lord's And The MCC*, (London and Counties Press Association, London 1914).
- Hawke, Lord, *Recollections And Reminiscences*, (Williams and Norgate, London 1924).
- Haygarth, A., *Scores And Biographies*, (Vol.I-XIV), (Marylebone CC, London 1876).
- Hobbs, J.B., *Recovering the "Ashes", 1911-12*, (Pitman, London 1912).
- Hornung, E.W., *Fathers of Men*, (Smith, London 1912).
- Hughes, T., *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, (Puffin, London 1986, 1st edn. 1857).

- Hyndman, H.M., *The Record of an Adventurous Life*, (Macmillan, London 1911).
- Inglis, G., *Sport and Pastimes in Australia*, (Methuen, London 1912).
- Kiddle, J.Beacham (ed.), *Melbourne Church of England Grammar School, Liber Melburniensis 1848-1936*, (Robertson and Mullers, Melbourne 1937).
- Kipling, R., *Definitive Edition Of Rudyard Kipling's Verse*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1940).
- Knight, A.E., *The Complete Cricketer*, (Methuen, London 1906).
- Lambert, W., *Instructions and Rules for playing the Noble Game of Cricket*, (Sussex Press, Lewes 1818).
- Laver, F., *An Australian Cricketer on Tour*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1905).
- Lillywhite, F., *The English Cricketer's Trip to Canada and the U.S.*, (F.Lillywhite, London 1860).
- Martineau, G.D., *The Epic of Hornden Green. A Ballad of Village Cricket*, (W.Heffer and sons, Cambridge 1926).
- May, P.R., *With the MCC in New Zealand*, (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1907).
- Miles, E.H., *Let's Play the Game; Or the Anglo-Saxon Sportsmanlike Spirit*, (Gilbert Pitman, London 1904).
- Moody, C.P., *The English Cricketers tour in the Colonies*, (Hussey and Gillingham, Adelaide 1898).
- Newbolt, H., *Collected Poems, 1897-1907*, (Thomas Nelson, London 1910).
- Noble, M.A., *The Game's the Thing*, (Cassell, London 1926).
- Nyren, J., *The Young Cricketer's Tutor*, (Davis-Pointer, London 1974 , 1st edn. 1834).
- Pardon, C.F., *The Australians in England. A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1882*, (Bell's Life in London, London 1882).
- Pardon, C.F., *The Australians in England. A Complete Record of the Cricket Tour of 1882*, (Facsimile re-print by J.W.McKenzie, Epsom 1982, 1st edn.1882).
- Price, A.B., *English Cricketers At Barbados During The Winter Of 1896-97*, (West Indian Guardian, Barbados 1897).
- Pycroft, J., *Cricketana*, (Longman, London 1865).
- Pycroft, J., *The Cricket Field*, (Spottiswoode, London 1851).
- Ranjitsinhji, K.S., *The Jubilee Book Of Cricket*, (Blackwood, Edinburgh 1897).
- Ranjitsinhji, K.S., *With Stoddart's Team in Australia*, (Bowden, London, 1898).

- Russell, C.J.F., *Some Recollections of Cricket*, (H.G.Fisher, Woburn 1879).
- Seeley, J.R., *Expansion of England, Two Courses of Lectures*, (Macmillan, London 1895).
- Sewell, E.D., *An Outdoor Wallah*, (Stanley Paul, London 1945).
- Shaw, A. & Pullin, E.W., ('Old Ebor'), *Alfred Shaw, Cricketer - His Career and Reminiscences*, (Cassell, London 1902).
- Spencer, H., *Education. Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*, (William and Norgate, London 1906).
- Standing, P.C., *Cricket of To-day and Yesterday*, (2 Vols.), (Caxton, London 1904).
- Stanton, J.H., *Bringing Back The Ashes. The MCC Tour In Australia, 1903-04*, (Sheffield Telegraph Ltd., Sheffield 1904).
- Steele, A.G. & Lyttelton, R.H. (eds.), *The Badminton Book of Cricket*, (Longmans, Green, London 1901).
- Strutt, J., *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*, (J.White, London 1801).
- Suffolk, Earl of, Peek, H. & Aflalo, F.G.(eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Sports*, (Lawrence and Bullen, London 1898).
- Taylor, A.D., *Annals Of Lord's And The History Of The MCC*, (Arrowsmith, Bristol 1903).
- The Times* (ed.), *MCC. 1787-1937*, (The Times Publishing Co., London 1937).
- Trevor, P.C.W., *The Problems Of Cricket*, (Sampson, Low and Marston, London 1907).
- Trevor, P.C.W., *With the MCC in Australia*, (Alston Rivers, London 1908).
- Trollope, A., *Victoria and Tasmania...Being a Portion of the Work Entitled 'Australia and New Zealand', by the Same Author*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1874).
- Trollope, A., (ed.), *British Sports and Pastimes*, (Virtue, London 1868).
- Twopenny, R.E.N., *Town Life in Australia*, (Elliot Stock, London 1888).
- Warner, P.F., *Cricket In Many Climes*, (Heinemann, London 1900).
- Warner, P.F., *England V. Australia*, (Mills and Boon, London 1912).
- Warner, P.F., *How We Recovered The Ashes*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1904).
- Warner, P.F., *Lord's, 1787-1945*, (Pavilion Books, London 1987 - 1st edn.1946).
- Warner, P.F., *The MCC In South Africa*, (Chapman and Hall, London 1906).

Essays, Articles, Pamphlets and Contributions to Books

- Abell, H.F., 'Is Cricket Degenerating?', *National Review*, Vol.31, (1898).
- Aflalo, F.G., 'Sport at Home and Abroad', *Empire Review*, Vol.3, (1902).
- Aflalo, F.G., 'The Spoil-sport', *Empire Review*, Vol.4, (1902-3),.
- Almond, H.H., 'Football as a Moral Agent', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.34, (1893).
- Anon., 'Cricket' in Trollope, (ed.), *British Sports and Pastimes*, (1868).
- Anon., 'Gentlemen v. Players', *Punch*, (12 Sept. 1896).
- Anon., 'Outdoor Men. Canon the Hon.Edward Lyttelton', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.3, (1905).
- Anon., 'Outdoor Men. Hon.F.S.Jackson', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.3, (1905).
- Anon., 'Outdoor Men. Rt. Hon. Walter Hume Long', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.3, (1905).
- Anon., 'The Fine Old English Game' (c.1830), in Box, *The English Game of Cricket*, (1877).
- Anon., *Official Souvenir of Maclaren's English Cricket Team in Australia*, (Bookstall Co., Sydney 1901).
- Anon., *Reply by the Melbourne Cricket Club to the "Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association"*, (Melbourne CC, Melbourne 1912).
- Anon., *Statement by the Victorian Cricket Association*, (City Press Print, Melbourne 1912).
- Anon., *Statement of the Citizen's Cricket Committee*, (n.p., Melbourne 1912).
- Astley-Cooper, J., 'An Anglo-Saxon Olympiad', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.32, (1892).
- Astley-Cooper, J., 'The Pan-Britannic Gathering', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.34, (1893).
- Bligh, E.V., 'Overgrown County Cricket', *Empire Review*, Vol.2, (1902).
- Brabazon, Lord, 'An Appeal to Men of Wealth', *National Review*, Vol.5, (1885).
- Brabazon, Lord, 'Open Spaces and Physical Education', *National Review*, Vol.8, (1886-7).

- Brodrick, G.C., 'A Nation of Amateurs', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.48, (1900).
- Bury, Viscount, 'The Unity of Empire', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.17, (1885).
- Damley, Lord, 'Defence of the Tutorial System at Eton', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.17, (1885).
- Ford, W.J., 'English Cricket on Australian Grounds', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.6, (1898).
- Ford, W.J., 'Is County Cricket Really "Overgrown"?', *Empire Review*, Vol.2 (1902).
- Ford, W.J., 'The Australian XI', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.11, (1899).
- Ford, W.J., 'Thoughts on Spectators', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.8, (1899).
- Fothergill (M.D), J.Milner, 'The Effects of Town Life upon the Human Body', *National Review*, Vol.10, (1887-88).
- Fry, C.B., "'How Shall We Produce a Nation Of Marksmen?'"', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.4, (1905-6).
- Fry, C.B., 'Sanity and County Cricket', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.21, (1914).
- Fry, C.B., 'Straight Talk', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.4, (1905-06).
- Fry, C.B., 'The Blot on British Games', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.4, (1905-6).
- Fry, C.B., 'The Morals of County Cricket', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.16, (1911-12).
- Gilkes, A.H., 'The Worship of Athletics', *National Review*, Vol.30 (1897-98).
- Gordon, H., 'Australian Tours in England', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 14, (1902).
- Gordon, H., 'Cricket Captains', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 10, (1900).
- Gordon, H., 'Cricket Characteristics', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 15, (1902).
- Gordon, H., 'Cricket Twenty Years Ago, and Now', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.14, (1902).
- Gordon, H., 'English Teams in Australia', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 13, (1901).
- Gordon, H., 'The Coming Cricket Season', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 10, (1900).
- Gordon, H., 'The Coming Cricket Season', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 12, (1901).
- Gordon, H., 'The Coming Cricket Season', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 14, (1902).

- Gordon, H., 'The Past Cricket Season', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 13, (1901).
- Gordon, H., 'The Past Cricket Season', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 15, (1902).
- Gordon, H., 'The Present Australian Team', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 15, (1902).
- Gordon, H. & Leveson-Gower, H.D.G., 'The Status of Amateurs in Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 14, (1902).
- Hallam, E., 'Cricket from the Ladies Tent', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.6, (1898).
- Harris, Lord, 'Bombay', in *The British Empire Series - British Empire League*, Vol.1, (1899).
- Harris, Lord, 'The Development of Cricket', *National Review*, Vol.2, (1883-4).
- Hawke, Lord, 'On Captaincy' in *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 14, (1902).
- Hawke, Lord, 'The Unwritten Laws of Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.22, (1905).
- Hodgson, W.E., 'The Degradation of British Sports', *National Review*, Vol.17, (1891).
- Hopeton, Earl of, 'Sport in Victoria', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.1, (1895).
- Hutchinson, H.G., 'Parlous Condition of Cricket', *National Review*, Vol.35, (1900).
- 'Ithuriel', 'Lord Alverstone', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.3, (1905).
- Jackson, N.L., 'Professionalism and Sport', *Fortnightly Review*, Vol.67, (1900).
- Jeffries, R., 'In Defence of Sport', *National Review*, Vol.1, (1883).
- Lucas, E.V., 'A Frenchman in the Pavilion', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.1, (1904).
- Lyttelton, Hon Sir A. & Steel, A.G., *et al.*, 'Cricket Reform: The L.B.W. Rule', *Empire Review*, Vol.1, (1901).
- Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. E., 'More about the Cricket Problem', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.11, (1900).
- Lyttelton, Hon. E., 'Athletics in Public Schools', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.7, (1880).
- Lyttelton, Hon. R.H., 'Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.3, (1896).
- Lyttelton, Hon. Sir. A., 'Cricket reform', in *National Review*, Vol.34, (1899-1900).
- Lyttelton, N.G., 'Some Eton and Harrow Matches, 1858-1864', *National Review*, Vol.25, (1895).

- Maclaren, A.C., 'Cricket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.3, (1896).
- Maxwell, H., 'Are We Really a Nation of Amateurs?', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.48, (1900).
- Mayo, Earl of, 'Realities of Baseball', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.3, (1905).
- Miles, E., 'On Applause in Play', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.16, (1911-12).
- Miles, E., 'Sport and Athletics, and the British Empire', in *The British Empire Series - British Empire League*, Vol.5, (1902).
- Mitchell, R.A.H., 'Cricket Reform', *Empire Review*, Vol.1, (1901).
- Perkins, H., 'Lord's and the M.C.C.', in Suffolk, Peek & Aflalo (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Sports*, (1898).
- 'Rapier', 'Notes by Rapier', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.3, (1896).
- Romanes, G.J., 'Recreation', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.6, (1879).
- Russell, F.S., 'Our Public Schools as a Public Peril', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.52, (1902).
- Salt, H.S., 'Confessions of an Eton Master', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.17, (1885).
- Smith, E., 'The Throwing Question - A Defence of the County Captains' Policy', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 12, (1901).
- Smith, F.E., 'The Vogue of Games. Is it Worth it?', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.1, (1904).
- 'The Gaffer' 'Village Cricket', *Cricketer and Hockey Player*, (1907) reprinted in Allen, *Cricket's Silver Linings, 1864-1914*, (1987).
- 'The Old Fag' 'Answers to Correspondents', *The Captain*, Vol.17, (1907).
- Vaile, P.A., 'Where John Bull Fails', *Fry's Magazine*, Vol.4, (1905-6).
- 'Various County Captains', 'Widening the Wickets: A Correspondence', *Empire Review*, Vol.5, (1903).
- Walker, R.D., 'Eton and Harrow Match', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.5, (1897).
- Walker, R.D., 'Lord's up to Date' in *Badminton Magazine*, Vol.10, (1900).
- Warner, P.F., 'The Ethics of Test Matches', *The Empire Review*, Vol.4, (1902-3).
- Warner, P.F., 'The Proposed Alteration in the Law of Leg-Before-Wicket', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 12, (1901).
- Warner, P.F., 'The Throwing Question', *Badminton Magazine*, Vol. 12, (1901).
- 'Wattle Blossom', 'The Australian XI', in Boyle & Scott, *The Australian Cricketers' Guide, 1883-84*, (1884).

- Welldon, J.E.C., 'The Training of an English Gentleman in the Public Schools', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.60, (1906).
- Wentworth, Bishop C., 'Pindar and Athletics', *National Review*, Vol.11, (1888).
- Wyatt, H.F., 'War as the Supreme Test of National Value', *Nineteenth Century*, Vol.46, (1899).

Serials

- Age.
- Argus.
- Athletic News and Cyclists' Journal.
- Athletic News Cricket Annudl.
- Australasian.
- Badminton Magazine.
- Bell's Life In Sydney.
- Bell's Life in London.
- Bell's Life in Victoria .
- Bulletin.
- Cricket Chat: Gleanings from 'Cricket' during 1883-84, 1885-86, 1886-87, 1887-1888, (Cricket Office, London 1884- 1889).
- Cricket Field.
- The Cricket Handbook, (John Leng, London 1902-08).
- Cricket World.
- Cricket.
- Empire Review.
- Fortnightly Review
- Fry's Magazine.
- Imperial Federation; The Journal of the Imperial Federation League.
- Leader.
- Lillywhite's Cricketers Annual.
- National Review.
- Nineteenth Century.
- Punch.
- Sporting Life.
- Sydney Morning Herald.
- Times.
- Wisden's Cricketers Almanack.

Reference Works

- Australian Dictionary of Biography, (Vols.1-11).*
- Bibliography Of Cricket.*
- Biographical Register of Australia, 1788-1938.*
- Boase Modern English Biography, 1850-1920.*
- Burke's Colonial Gentry.*
- Burke's Landed Gentry.*
- Burke's Peerage.*
- Butterworth's Dictionary of Business Biography.*
- Cockayne's Complete Peerage (revised by the Hon.Vicary Gibbs,1940).*
- Dictionary of National Biography.*
- Foster's Baronetage and Knightage for 1883.*
- Foster's Men-At-The-Bar.*
- Haygarth's Scores and Biographies.*
- Mowle's Genealogical History of the Pioneer Families of Australia.*
- Henderson's Australian Families.*
- Who Was Who. Vol.I, II, III, IV,(1897-1950).*
- Who's Who of First-Class Cricketers.*
- Alumni Cambridgiensis, Part II,1752-1900.*
- Alumni Oxoniensis, 1715-1886.*
- The Army Gazette.*
- List of officers of the Royal Regiment of Artillery.*
- Dictionary of Naval Biography.*
- Eton School Lists,1791-1850;1853-1892.*
- Harrow School Register, 1800-1911 (3rd Edition).*
- Loretto School Register, 1825-1925.*
- Malvern College Register, 1865-1914.*
- Marlborough College Register, 1843-1909 (6th Edition).*
- Rugby School Lists, 1858-1900.*
- Westminster School Biographical List, Vol.1 and 2 up to 1927.*
- Winchester College Register.*

Secondary Sources

Books

- Abercrombie, N., Hills, S. & Turner, B.S., *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1980).
- Allison, L. (ed.), *The Politics of Sport*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1986).
- Alomes, S., *A Nation at Last?*, (Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, N.S.W. 1988).
- Arlott, J., *Jack Hobbs. Profile of "The Master"*, (John Murray, Davis-Poynter, London 1981).
- Atkinson, A., *Camden, Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1988).
- Bailey, P., *Leisure and Class in Victorian England. Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control, 1830-1885*, (Methuen, London 1987).
- Baker, W.J., *Sports in the Western World*, (University of Illinois Press, Illinois, 1988).
- Bale, J., *Sport and Place. A Geography of Sport in England, Scotland and Wales*, (C.Hurst, London 1982).
- Bamford, T.W., *Rise of the Public Schools. A Study of Boy's Public Boarding Schools in England and Wales from 1837 to the Present Day*, (Nelson, London 1967).
- Beckett, J.V., *The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914*, (Blackwell, Oxford 1986).
- Benning, D.(ed.), *Sport and Imperialism. The Proceedings Of The Fourth Annual Conference Of The BSSH*, (BSSH, North Staffs.1986).
- Benning, D., (ed.), *Society, Religion and Sport. The Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of the BSSH*, (BSSH, North Staffs. 1983).
- Best, G., *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75*, (Fontana, London 1989).
- Birley, D., *Willow Wand*, (Simon and Schuster, London 1989).
- Bishop, T.J.H. & Wilkinson, R., *Winchester and the Public School Elite*, (Faber and Faber, London, 1967).
- Bolt, C., *Victorian Attitudes to Race*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1971).
- Bowen, R., *Cricket. A History Of Its Growth And Development Throughout The World*, (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1970).
- Brailsford, D., *Sport and Society. Elizabeth to Anne*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1969).

- Bright-Holmes, J.,(ed.), *The Joy Of Cricket*, (Unwin Publications, London 1985).
- Brohm, J-M., *Sport - A Prison of Measured Time*, (Ink Links, London 1978).
- Brookes, C., *English Cricket. The Game and its Players Through the Ages*, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1978).
- Buckley, K. & Wheelwright, T., *No Paradise for Workers. Capitalism and the Common People in Australia, 1788-1914*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1988).
- Burgmann, V. & Lee, J. *Constructing a Culture. A People's History of Australia since 1788*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic.1988).
- Butlin, N.G., *Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1964).
- Cannadine, D., *Lords and Landlords: The Aristocracy and the Towns, 1774-1967*, (Leicester University Press, Leicester 1980).
- Cannon, M., *The Landboomers*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1966).
- Cashman, R., *'Ave A Go Yer Mug. Australian Cricket Crowds from Larrikin to Ocker*, (Collins, Sydney 1987).
- Cashman, R., *Australian Cricket Crowds. Daily Figures 1877-1984*, (History Project Incorporated, University Of New South Wales, N.S.W. 1984).
- Cashman, R., *Patrons, Players, And The Crowd. The Phenomenon Of Indian Cricket*, (Orient Longman, India 1980).
- Cashman, R. & Mckernan, M., (eds.), *Sport in History. The Making of Modern Sporting Traditions*, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia 1979).
- Cashman, R. & Mckernan, M., (eds.), *Sport: Money, Morality and the Media*, (New South Wales University Press, Kensington 1981).
- Clark, C.M.H., *History of Australia* , Vol.4, 1851-1888; Vol.5, 1888-1915, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1979,1981).
- Clarke, J. & Critcher, C., *The Devil Makes Work. Leisure in Capitalist Britain*, (Macmillan, London 1985).
- Coldham, J.D., *Lord Harris*, (George Allen and Unwin, London 1983).
- Coldham, J.P., *F.S.Jackson. A Cricketing Biography*, (Crowood Press, Marlborough 1989).
- Colls, R.& Dodd, P. (eds.), *Englishness. Politics and Culture 1880-1920*, (Croom Helm, London 1986).
- Connell, R.W., *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture: Studies of Conflict, Power and Hegemony in Australian Life*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1977).
- Connell, R.W. & Irving, T.H., *Class Structure in Australian History. Documents, Narrative and Argument*, (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1980).

- Cooper, L. & Synge, A., *Beyond the Far Pavilions*, (Pavilion Books, London 1986).
- Crowley, F., *A New History of Australia*, (Heinemann, Melbourne 1974).
- Cumes, J.W.C., *Their Chastity was not too Rigid: Leisure Times in Early Australia*, (Longmans Cheshire, Melbourne 1979).
- Cunningham, H., *The Volunteer Force. A Social and Political History*, (Croom Helm, London 1975).
- Davidoff, L., *The Best Circles. Society, Etiquette and the Season*, (Croom Helm, London 1973).
- Davison, G., *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1978).
- De Serville, P., *Port Phillip Gentlemen*, (Oxford University Press, London 1980).
- Derriman, P., *True to the Blue*, (NSWCA, Sydney 1987).
- Dobbs, B., *Edwardians at Play. Sport, 1890-1914*, (Pelham Books, London 1973).
- Donajgrodzki, A.P. (ed.), *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (Croom Helm, London 1977).
- Dunning, E. & Sheard, K., *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*, (Martin Robertson, Oxford 1979).
- Dunning, E.(ed.), *The Sociology of Sport*, (Frank Cass, London 1971).
- Dunstan, K., *Sports*, (Cassell, Melbourne, 1973).
- Dunstan, K., *The Paddock that Grew. The Story of the Melbourne Cricket Club*, (Cassell, London 1962).
- Elias, N & Dunning, E., *Quest for Excitement. Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*, (Blackwell, Oxford 1986).
- Fiddian, M., *The Pioneers. 100 Years of Association Football*, (Victorian Football Association, Melbourne 1977).
- Frewin, L., *The Poetry of Cricket*, (Macdonald, London 1964).
- Frith, D., *'My Dear Victorious Stod'. A Biography of A.E.Stoddart*, (Lutterworth Press, Guildford 1977).
- Garthorne-Hardy, J., *The Public School Phenomenon*, (Penguin, London 1979).
- Giddens, A., *The Class Structure in Advanced Societies*, (Hutchinson, London 1981).
- Giddens, A. & Held, D. (eds.), *Classes, Power, and Conflict. Classical and Contemporary Debates*, (Macmillan, Basingstoke 1988).
- Giddens, A. & Stanworth, P., *Elites and Power in British History*, (Cambridge University Press, London 1974).

- Goldberg, S.L. & Smith, F.B. (eds.), *Australian Cultural History*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988).
- Gorz, A., *Socialism and Revolution*, (Allen Lane, London 1975).
- Grant, J., & Serle, G.(eds.), *The Melbourne Scene, 1803-1956*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1957).
- Gratton, C. & Taylor, P., *Sport and Recreation: An Economic Analysis*, (E. and F.N. Spon, London 1985).
- Green, B., *A History of Cricket*, (Barrie and Jenkins, London 1988).
- Gruneau, R., *Class, Sports, and Social Development*, (University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst 1983).
- Gruneau, R. & Cantelon, H., (eds.), *Sport, Culture, and the Modern State*, (Toronto, 1982).
- Guttmann, A., *From Ritual to Record. The Nature of Modern Sports*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1978).
- Guttmann, A., *Sports Spectators*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1986).
- Guttsman, W.L.(ed.), *The English Ruling Class*, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1969).
- Hardy, F., *Power without Glory*, (Angus and Robertson, Melbourne, 1982).
- Hargreaves, J. (ed.), *Sport, Culture and Ideology*, (Routledge, London 1982).
- Hargreaves, J.A., *Sport, Power and Culture. A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain*, (Polity Press, Cambridge 1987).
- Hart, M. (ed.), *Sport in the Sociocultural Process*, (Wm.C.Brown, Dubuque Iowa 1976).
- Harte, C., *The History Of The Sheffield Shield*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1987).
- Hartz, L. (ed.), *The Founding of New Societies. Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada and Australia*, (Harcourt, Brace and World inc., New York 1964).
- Hoberman, J.M., *Sport and Political Ideology*, (Heinemann, London 1984).
- Hobsbawm, E.J., *The Age of Empire*, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1987).
- Hobsbawm, E.J. & Ranger, T. (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988).
- Holt, R., *Sport and the British*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1990).
- Holt, R. (ed.), *Sport and the Working Class in Modern Britain*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1990).
- Honey, J.R. de S., *Tom Brown's Universe*, (Millington, London 1977).

- Horne, J., Jary, D. & Tomlinson, A. (eds.), *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1987).
- Howat, G., *Plum Warner*, (Unwin Hyman, London 1987).
- Huizinga, J., *Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play Element in Culture*, (Temple Smith, London 1970).
- Inglis, K.S., *The Australian Colonists: An Exploration of Social History*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1974).
- Jackson, R.V., *Economic Development in the Nineteenth Century*, (Australian National University Press, Canberra 1977).
- James, C.L.R., *Beyond a Boundary*, (Stanley Paul, London 1986, 1st. edn 1963)
- Joll, J., *Gramsci*, (Fontana, London 1983).
- Jones, S.G., *Sport, Politics and the Working Class. Organised Labour and Sport in Inter-war Britain*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1988).
- Kiddle, M., *Men of Yesterday. A Social History of the Western District of Victoria, 1834-1890*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1961).
- Kingston, B., *Oxford History of Australia. Glad Confident Morning 1860-1900*, Vol.3, (Oxford University Press, London 1988).
- Kircher, R. (Bradley, R.N. trans.), *Fair Play: The Games of Merrie England*, (W.Collins, London 1928).
- Lawrence, G. & Rowe D., *Power Play: The Commercialisation of Australian Sport*, (Hale and Iremonger, Sydney 1987).
- Lawson, S., *The Archibald Paradox*, (Penguin, Ringwood Vic. 1987).
- Lee, C., *From the Sea End. The Official History of Sussex County Cricket Club*, (Partridge Press, London 1989).
- Lemmon, D., *The Crisis of Captaincy. Servant and Master in English Cricket*, (Christopher Helm, London 1988).
- Lemmon, D., *The Official History of Surrey CCC*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989).
- Lewis, A., *Double Century. The Story Of MCC and Cricket*, (Hodder and Stoughton, London 1987).
- Lowerson, J. & Myerscough, J., *Time to Spare in Victorian England*, (Harvester, Hassocks 1977).
- McCrone, K.E., *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914*, (Routledge, 1988).
- McIntosh, P., *Fair Play. Ethics in Sport and Education*, (Heinemann, London 1979).
- McIntosh, P., *Sport in Society*, (West London Press, London 1987).

- Macintyre, S., *The Oxford History of Australia. The Succeeding Age, 1901-1942, Vol.4*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1986).
- Macintyre, S., *Winners and Losers. The Pursuit of Social Justice in Australian History*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney 1985).
- MacKenzie, J.M. (ed.), *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1985).
- McLachlan, N., *Waiting for The Revolution. A History of Australian Nationalism*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic. 1989).
- McNicol, R., *Number 36 Collins Street. Melbourne Club, 1838-1988*, (Allen and Unwin, Haynes and the Melbourne Club, Sydney 1988).
- McNicol, R., *The Early Years of the Melbourne Club*, (Hawthorn Press, Melbourne 1976).
- McQueen, H., *A New Britannia: An Argument Concerning the Social Origins of Australian Radicalism*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic. 1986 - Revised edition).
- Malcolmson, R., *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850.*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1974).
- Mancini, A. & Hibbins, G.M. (ed.), *Running with the Ball. Football's Foster Father*, (Lynedoch Pubs., Melbourne 1987).
- Mandell, R.D., *Sport: A Cultural History*, (University of Columbia Press, New York 1984).
- Mandle, W.F., *Going it Alone: Australia's National Identity*, (Penguin, Ringwood, Vic. 1978).
- Mangan, J.A., *Athleticism In The Victorian and Edwardian Public School*, (Oxford University Press, London 1981).
- Mangan, J.A., *The Games Ethic and Imperialism*, (Viking, London 1986).
- Mangan, J.A. & Park, R.J.(eds.), *From Fair Sex to Feminism*, (Frank Cass, London 1987).
- Mangan, J.A. & Small, R.B. (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (E.F.Spon, London 1986).
- Mangan, J.A. & Walvin, J. (eds.), *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1987).
- Mangan, J.A. (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism. British Culture and Sport at Home and Abroad 1700-1914*, (Frank Cass, London 1988).
- Mangan, J.A. (ed.), *Sport and National Identity. The Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of the BSSH*, (BSSH, North Staffs. 1985).
- Marcuse, H., *Counter-Revolution and Revolt*, (Allen Lane, London 1972).
- Marshall, M., *Gentlemen and Players. Conversations with Cricketers*, (Grafton Books, London 1987).

- Martin, A.W. (ed.), *Essays in Australian Federation*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1969).
- Martin, G., *Bunyip Aristocracy. The New South Wales Constitutional Debate of 1853 and Hereditary Institutions in the British Colonies*, (Croom Helm, Surry Hills, NSW 1986).
- Mason, A., *Association Football and English Society*, (Harvester, Brighton 1980).
- Mason, A., *Sport in Britain*, (Faber and Faber, London 1988).
- Mason, A., *Sport in British History*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1989).
- Midwinter, E., *Fair Game, Myth and Reality in Sport*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1986).
- Midwinter, E., *W.G. Grace: His Life and Times*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1981).
- Miliband, R., *Class Power and State Power - Political Essays*, (Verso, London 1983).
- Miliband, R., *The State in Capitalist Society. The Analysis of the Western System of Power*, (Quartet Books, London 1973).
- Moore, D., *The History of Kent County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1988).
- Moorhouse, G., *Lord's*, (Hodder And Stoughton, London, 1983).
- Morris, J., *Farewell the Trumpet's*, (Penguin, London 1987).
- Morris, J., *Heaven's Command. An Imperial Progress*, (Penguin, London 1984).
- Morris, J., *Pax Britannica. The Climax of an Empire*, (Penguin, London 1984).
- Morris, J., *Spectacle of Empire*, (Faber and Faber, London 1982).
- Morris, R.J., *Class and Class Consciousness in the Industrial Revolution 1780-1850*, (Macmillan Press, London 1979).
- Mulvaney, D.J. & Harcourt, R., *Cricket Walkabout: The Australian Aboriginal Cricketers on Tour, 1867-68*, (Macmillan, London 1988).
- Nairn, T., *The Enchanted Glass. Britain and its Monarchy*, (Picador, London 1990).
- Nandy, A., *The Tao of Cricket*, (Penguin, New Delhi 1989).
- Neale, R.S., *Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1972).
- Neale, R.S., *Class in English History, 1680-1850*, (Blackwell, Oxford 1981).

- Norris, R., *The Emergent Commonwealth*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1975).
- Pearson, G., *Hooligan. A History of Respectable Fears*, (Macmillan, Basingstoke 1990).
- Perkin, H., *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1969).
- Perkin, H., *The Rise of Professional Society. England since 1880*, (Routledge, London 1989).
- Pollard, J., *The Formative Years Of Australian Cricket. 1803-1892*, (Angus and Robertson, London 1987).
- Pollard, J., *The Turbulent Years of Australian Cricket, 1893-1917*, (Angus and Robertson, London 1988).
- Porter, C., *The White Horse and the Kangaroo. Kent v. The Australians, 1882-1977*, (Meresborough Books, Gillingham 1981).
- Pugh, M., *The Making of Modern British Politics, 1867-1939*, (Blackwell, Oxford 1990).
- Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith (eds., trans.), *Antonio Gramsci. Selections from Prison Notebooks*, (Lawrence and Wishart, London 1986).
- Rait-Kerr, Col. R.S., *The Laws of Cricket. Their History and Growth*, (Longmans, London 1950).
- Rickard, J., *Australia. A Cultural History*, (Longman, London 1988).
- Rickard, J., *Class and Politics. New South Wales, Victoria and the Early Commonwealth, 1890-1910*, (Australian National University Press, Canberra 1976).
- Rigauer, B. (trans. Guttman, A.), *Sport and Work*, (Columbia University Press, New York 1981).
- Rippon, A., *The Story of Middlesex County Cricket Club*, (Moorland publishing, n.p. 1982).
- Rogerson, S., *Wilfred Rhodes: Professional and Gentleman*, (Hollis Carter, London 1960).
- Ross, A., *Ranji. Prince of Cricketers*, (Collins, London 1983).
- Royle, E., *Modern Britain. A Social History, 1750-1985*, (Edward Arnold, London 1987).
- Rubinstein, W.D., *Elites and the Wealthy in Modern British History*, (Harvester, Brighton 1987).
- Scott, E., *Historical Memoirs of the Melbourne Club*, (Speciality Press Ltd., Melbourne 1936).
- Scott, J., *The Upper Classes. Property and Privilege in Britain*, (Macmillan, London 1986).

- Serle, G., *The Golden Age. A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851-1861*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1963).
- Serle, G., *The Rush to Be Rich - A History of the Colony of Victoria 1883-1889*, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1971).
- Shredborough, R. & Anderson, H., *Victorian Squatters*, (Red Rooster Press, Melbourne 1983).
- Simon, B. & Bradley, I., *The Victorian Public School. Studies in the Development of an Educational Institution*, (Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1975).
- Sinclair, W.A., *The Process of Economic Development*, (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne 1976).
- Sissons, R., *The Players. A Social History of the Professional Cricketer*, (Heinemann, London 1988).
- Sissons, R. & Stoddart, B., *Cricket And Empire. The 1932-33 Bodyline Tour Of Australia*, (Allen and Unwin, London 1984).
- Souter, G., *Lion and Kangaroo. The Initiation of Australia, 1901-1919*, (Collins, Sydney, 1976).
- Springhall, J.O., *Youth Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883-1940*, (Croom Helm, London 1977).
- Stannage, C.T. (ed.), *A New History of Western Australia*, (University of Western Australia Press, Perth 1981).
- Statham, P. (ed.), *The Origins of Australia's Capital Cities*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1989).
- Stoddart, B., *Saturday Afternoon Fever: Sport in the Australian Culture*, (Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, N.S.W. 1987).
- Stone, L. & J.C.F., *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1984).
- Storch, R.D., *Popular Culture and Custom in Nineteenth-Century England*, (Croom Helm, London 1982).
- Sullivan, M., *Men and Women of Port Phillip*, (Hale and Iremonger, Sydney 1985).
- Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class*, (Penguin, Harmondsworth 1968).
- Thompson, E.P., *The Poverty of Theory*, (Merlin Press, London 1978).
- Thompson, F.M.L., *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1963).
- Thompson, F.M.L., *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950. Social Agencies and Institutions, Vol.3* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990).
- Thompson, F.M.L., *The Rise of Respectable Society. A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830-1900*, (Fontana, London 1900).

- Turner, I. & Sanderson, L., *Up Where Cazaly? The Great Australian Game*, (Granada, London 1981).
- Tyson, F., *The History of the Richmond Cricket Club*, (Richmond Cricket Club, Melbourne 1987).
- Vamplew, W., *Pay Up and Play the Game. Professional Sport in Britain, 1875-1914*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988).
- Vamplew, W., *The Turf. A Social and Economic History of Horse Racing*, (Allen Lane, London 1976).
- Veblen, T., *The Theory of The Leisure Class. An Economic Study of Institutions*, (Macmillan, London 1908).
- Walvin, J., *Leisure and Society, 1830-1950*, (Longman, London 1978).
- Ward, R., *The Australian Legend*, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne 1965).
- Weber, M. (trans. Parsons, T.), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, (Unwin University Books, London 1967).
- White, R., *Inventing Australia - Images and Identity 1688-1980*, (Allen and Unwin, Sydney 1981).
- Wiener, M.J., *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, (Pelican, London 1985).
- Wilkinson, R., *The Prefects. British Leadership and the Public School Tradition*, (Oxford University Press, London 1964).
- Williams, R., *Marxism and Literature*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977).
- Woodhouse, A., *The History of Yorkshire County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989).
- Wrigley, E.A., *Nineteenth Century Society. Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data*, (Cambridge University Press, London 1972).
- Wynne-Thomas, P., *The History of Lancashire County Cricket Club*, (Christopher Helm, London 1989).
- Wynne-Thomas, P. & Arnold, P., *Cricket in Conflict*, (Newness Books, Feltham 1984).
- Yeo, E. & S., *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914: Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure*, (Harvester Press, Brighton 1981).

Essays, Articles and Contributions to Books

- Abercrombie, N. & Turner, B.S., 'The Dominant Ideology Thesis' in Giddens & Held (eds.), *Classes, Power, and Conflict. Classical and Contemporary Debates*, (1988),

- Allison, L., 'Batsman and Bowler: The Key Relation of Victorian England', *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.7, no.2 (1985).
- Armstrong, W.A., 'The Use of Information about Occupation', in Wrigley, *Nineteenth Century Society*, (1972).
- Bale, J.R., 'Cricket in Pre-Victorian England and Wales', *Area*, Vol.13, no.2 (1981).
- Berghoff, H., 'Public Schools and the Decline of the British Economy', *Past and Present*, No.129, (November 1990).
- Bolton, G., 'The Idea of a Colonial Gentry', *Historical Studies*, Vol.13, (1968).
- Bourdieu, P., 'Sport and Social Class', *Social Science Information*, Vol.17, no.6 (1978).
- Bradley, J., 'The MCC, Society and Empire: A Portrait of Cricket's Ruling Body, 1860-1914', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.7, no.1 (1990).
- Brailsford, D., '1787: An English Sporting Year', *Research Quarterly For Exercise and Sport*, Vol.55, no.3 (1984).
- Brailsford, D., 'Religion and Sport in Eighteenth Century England: For the Encouragement of Piety and for the Preventing of Vice, Profaneness and Immorality', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.2 (1984).
- Burton, Richard, D.E., 'Cricket and Carnival and the Street Culture in the Caribbean', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.2 (1985).
- Butlin, N.G., 'Australian National Accounts, 1788-1983', *Source Papers in Economic History*, (no.6), (Australian National University, Canberra 1985).
- Cain, P.J. & Hopkins, A.G., 'Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Expansion Overseas. I. The Old Colonial System, 1688-1850', *Economic History Review*, Vol.39, no.4 (1986).
- Cain, P.J. & Hopkins, A.G., 'Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Expansion Overseas. II. New Imperialism, 1850-1945', *Economic History Review*, Vol. 40, no.1 (1987).
- Cannadine, D., 'The Theory and Practice of the English Leisure Class', *Historical Journal*, Vol.21, no.2 (1978).
- Cashman, R., 'Cricket and Colonialism: Colonial Hegemony and Indigenous Subversion?', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism* (1988).
- Cashman, R., 'F.R.Spoofforth, "The Demon", (1853-1926): An Anglo-Australian Hero', in Benning (ed.), *Sport and Imperialism, The Proceedings Of The Fourth Annual Conference Of The BSSH*, (1986).
- Cashman, R., 'Symbols of Unity: Anglo-Australian Cricketers, 1877-1900', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.7, no.1 (1990).
- Cashman, R., 'The Making of Australian Sporting Traditions, 1977-87', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.1 (1987).

- Cashman, R., 'The Phenomenon of Indian Cricket', in Cashman & McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History. The Making of Modern Sporting History*, (1979).
- Chandler, J.L., 'Emergent Athleticism: Games in Two English Public Schools, 1800-60', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.3 (1987).
- Clark, D., 'Connell and Irving 2', *Labour History*, no.40, (1981).
- Coleman, D.C., 'Gentleman and Players', *Economic History Review*, Vol.26 (1973).
- Connolly, C.N., 'Class, Birthplace and Loyalty: Australian Attitudes to the Boer War', *Historical Studies*, Vol.18 (1978).
- Cox, R.W., 'Annual Bibliography of Publications on the History of Sport', *B.J.S.H.*, Vols. 1-7, (1984-1990).
- Daly, J.A., 'A New Britannia in the Antipodes: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, (1988).
- Davison, G., 'Sydney and the Bush: An Urban Context for the Australian Legend', *Historical Studies*, Vol.18 (1978).
- Dewar, J., 'Introduction of Western Sports to the Indian People of Canada's Prairie West', in Mangan & Small, (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (1986).
- Dodd, P., 'Englishness and the National Culture', in Colls & Dodd, *Englishness. Politics and Culture 1880-1920*, (1986).
- Donnelly, P. & Young, K.M., 'Reproduction and Transformation of Cultural Forms in Sport. A Contextual Analysis of Rugby', *International Review for the Sociology Of Sport*, Vol.20 (1985).
- Dunning, E., 'The Development of Modern Football', in Dunning (ed.), *The Sociology of Sport*, (1971).
- Elias, N. & Dunning, E., 'The Quest for Excitement in Leisure', in Elias & Dunning, *Quest for Excitement*, (1986).
- Fletcher, S., 'The Making and Breaking of a Female Tradition: Women's Physical Education in England, 1880-1980', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.1 (1985).
- Gammon, V., "'Babylonian Performances": The Rise and Suppression of Popular Church Music, 1660-1870', in Yeo, E. & S. (eds.), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914*, (1981).
- Geertz, C., 'Deep Play: Notes on a Balinese Cockfight', *Daedalus*, Vol.101, no.1 (1972).
- Gollan, R., 'Class Structure in Australian History. The Bones Stripped Bare', *Historical Studies*, Vol.18 (1978).
- Goodwin, P.J., 'Thomas Arnold: So What?', *Physical Education Review*, Vol.7, no.2 (1984).

- Gruneau, R., 'Sport and the Debate on the State', in Gruneau & Cantelon, *Sport, Culture, and the Modern State*, (1982).
- Halladay, E., 'Of Pride and Prejudice: The Amateur Question in English Nineteenth Century Rowing', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.1 (1987).
- Hargreaves, J., 'Sport and Hegemony. Some theoretical problems', in Gruneau & Cantelon, *Sport Culture and the Modern State*, (1982).
- Hargreaves, J., 'The Body Sport and Power Relations', in Horne, Jary & Tomlinson (eds.) *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, (1987).
- Hargreaves, J., 'The State and Sport. Programmed and Non-Programmed Intervention in Britain', in Allison (ed.), *The Politics of Sport*, (1986).
- Hargreaves, J., 'Theorising Sport: An Introduction', in Hargreaves (ed.), *Sport, Culture and Ideology*, (1982).
- Hartz, L., 'A Theory of the Development of New Societies', in Hartz (ed.), *The Founding of New Societies*, (1964).
- Heinemann, K., 'Socio-economic Problems of Sports Clubs', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol.19 (1984).
- Hill, J., '"First Class" Cricket and the Leagues: Some Notes on the Development of English Cricket, 1900-1940', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.1 (1987).
- Hirst, J.B., 'Egalitarianism', in Goldberg & Smith (eds.), *Australian Cultural History*, (1988).
- Hirst, J.B., 'Keeping Colonial History Colonial; The Hartz Thesis Revisited', *Historical Studies*, Vol.21, (1984).
- Hobsbawm, E.J., 'Mass Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914', in Hobsbawm & Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, (1988).
- Holt, R.J., 'Football and the Urban Way of Life in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism* (1988).
- Horne, J. & Jary, D., 'The Figurational Sociology of Sport and Leisure: an exposition and a Critique' in Horne, Jary, Tomlinson (eds.), *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, (1987).
- Howell, M.L. & Howell, R.A., 'The Effects of Acculturation on the Aborigine: A Case Study of the Sport of Cricket', in Mangan & Small (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (1986).
- Howkins, A., 'The Discovery of Rural England', in Colls & Dodd, *Englishness. Politics and Culture 1880-1920*, (1986).
- Inglis, K.S., 'Imperial Cricket: Test Matches between Australia and England, 1877-1900', in Cashman & McKernan (eds.), *Sport In History*, (1979).
- Jable, T., 'Latter-Day Cultural Imperialists: The British Influence on the Establishment of Cricket in Philadelphia, 1842-72', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism* (1988).

- Lansbury, C.A., 'Straight Bat and Modest Mind', *The Victorian Newsletter*, no.49 (1976).
- Lewis, R.M., 'Cricket and the Beginnings of Organized Baseball in New York City', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.2 (1987).
- Lowerson, J., 'Sport and the Victorian Sunday: The Beginnings of Middle Class Apostasy', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.2 (1984).
- McCrone, K.E., "'Play Up! Play Up! And Play the Game!' Sport at the Late Victorian Girls' Public Schools", *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.1 (1985).
- Macintosh, P.C., 'An Historical View of Sport and Social Control', *International Review of Sports Sociology*, Vol.6, (1971).
- Macintyre, S., 'Connell and Irving 1', *Labour History*, no.40, (May 1981).
- Macintyre, S., 'The Making of the Australian Working Class: An Historiographical Survey', *Historical Studies*, Vol.18, (1978).
- McKernan, M., 'Sport, War and Society: Australia 1914-18', in Cashman & McKernan (eds.), *Sport in History. The Making of Modern Sporting History*, (1979).
- Maguire, J.A., 'Conceptual and Methodological Confusion in Analyses of Nineteenth Century - Leisure the Case for Historical Sociology', in Mangan & Small (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (1986).
- Malcolmson, R.W., 'Sports in Society: a Historical perspective', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1 no.1 (1984).
- Mandle, W.F., 'Cricket and Australian Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, Vol.59, no.4 (1973).
- Mandle, W.F., 'Pommy Bastards and Damn Yankees', in Mandle, *Going It Alone. Australia's National Identity in the Twentieth Century*, (1978).
- Mandle, W.F., 'The Games People Played: Cricket and Football in England and Victoria in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Historical Studies*, Vol.15 (1973).
- Mandle, W.F., 'The Professional Cricketer in England in the Nineteenth Century', *Labour History*, no.23 (1972).
- Mandle, W.F., 'W.G. Grace as a Victorian Hero', *Historical Studies*, Vol.19 (1981).
- Mangan, J.A., 'Current Research: Liberal Education and the Ancient Universities: Ideology and Change in Victorian and Edwardian "Oxbridge"', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.2 (1987).
- Mangan, J.A., 'Philathlete Extraordinary: A Portrait of Victorian Moralist Edward Bowen', *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.9, no.3 (1982).

- Mangan, J.A., 'Social Darwinism, Sport and English Upper Class Education', *Stadion*, Vol.6 (1982).
- Mangan, J.A., 'The Grammar School and the Games Ethic in the Victorian and Edwardian Eras', *Albion*, Vol.15, no.4 (1983).
- Metcalf, A., '"Potshare Bowling" In the Mining Communities of East Northumberland, 1800-1914', In Holt (ed.), *Sport and the Working Class in Modern Britain*, (1990).
- Metcalf, A., 'Organised Sport in the Mining Communities of South Northumberland, 1800-1889', *Victorian Studies*, Vol.25, (1982).
- Moore, K., 'Sport, Politics, and Imperialism: The Evolution of the Concept of British Empire Games from 1891 to 1930', in Benning (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference of the British Society of Sports History*, (1986).
- Moore, K., 'The Pan-Britannic Festival: a tangible but forlorn expression of imperial unity', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, (1988).
- Moorehouse, H.F., 'Scotland against England: Football and Popular Culture', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.2 (1987).
- Morris, R.J., 'Clubs, Societies and Associations', in Thompson, *Cambridge Social History of Britain*, Vol.3, (1990).
- Morris, R.J., 'Voluntary Societies and the British Urban Elite, 1780-1850: An Analysis', *Historical Journal*, Vol.26, (1983).
- Park, R.J., 'British Sports and Pastimes in San Francisco 1848-1900', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.2 (1984).
- Park, R.J., 'Sport, Gender and Society in a Transatlantic Victorian Perspective', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.1 (1985).
- Parkin, F., 'Social Closure and Class Formation', in Giddens & Held (eds.), *Classes, Power and Conflict*, (1988).
- Perkin, H., 'Sport and Society: Empire Into Commonwealth', in Mangan & Small (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society*, (1986).
- Priestley, S., 'Melbourne: A Kangaroo Advance', in Statham, *The Origins of Australia's Capital Cities*, (1989).
- Redmond, G., 'Sport History in Academe: Reflections on a Half-century of Peculiar Progress', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.1 (1984).
- Reid, D.A., 'Folk-football, the Aristocracy and Cultural Change: A Critique of Dunning and Sheard', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.5, no.2, (1988).
- Rickard, J., 'Cultural History: the "High" and the "Popular"', in Goldberg & Smith (eds.), *Australian Cultural History*, (1988).
- Rosecrance, R.N., 'The Radical Culture of Australia', in Hartz (ed.), *The Founding of New Societies*, (1964).

- Rowe, D., 'The Packaging of Play: The Commercialisation of Sport and Leisure in Australia' *Working Papers in Australian Studies*, No.53, (Sir Robert Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, London 1990).
- Rubinstein, D., 'Sport and the Sociologist', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.1 (1984).
- Rubinstein, W.D., 'Men of Wealth' in Goldberg & Smith (eds.), *Australian Cultural History*, (1988).
- Sandiford, K.A.P., 'Cricket and the Victorian Society', *Journal of Social History*, Vol.17, no.2 (1983).
- Sandiford, K.A.P., 'Cricket and the Victorians', *Historical Reflections*, no.9 (1982).
- Sandiford, K.A.P., 'English Cricket Crowds During the Victorian Age', *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.9, no.3 (1982).
- Sandiford, K.A.P., 'The Professionalization of Modern Cricket', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.3 (1985).
- Sandiford, K.A.P., 'Victorian Cricket Technique and Industrial Technology', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.3 (1984).
- Sandiford, K.A.P. & Vamplew, W., 'The Peculiar Economics of English Cricket before 1914', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.3, no.3 (1986).
- Schofield, J.A., 'The Development of First Class Cricket in England: An Economic Analysis', *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol.30, no.4 (1982).
- Sharp, M.P., 'Moral Metaphor, Economic Reality and Public Perceptions: the Control of Cricket and Rugby in Sydney, 1890-1912', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.5, no.3 (1988).
- Shaw, A., 'The Founding of Melbourne', in Statham (ed.), *The Origins of Australia's Capital Cities*, (1989).
- Speck, M.A., 'Social Stratification and Participation in Sport in Mid-Victorian England with particular reference to Lancaster', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, (1988).
- Springhall, J., 'Building character in the British boy: the attempt to extend Christian Manliness to working-class adolescents, 1880-1914', in Mangan & Walvin (eds.), *Manliness and Morality*, (1987).
- Stedman-Jones, G., 'Class Expression Versus Social Control? A Critique of Recent Trends in the Social History of "Leisure"', *History Workshop*, Vol. 4, (1977).
- Stoddart, B., 'Cricket and Colonialism in the English Speaking Caribbean to 1914: Towards a Cultural Analysis', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, (1988).
- Stoddart, B., 'Sport and Society 1890-1940. A Foray', in Stannage (ed.), *A New History of Western Australia*, (1981).

- Stoddart, B., 'Sport, Cultural Imperialism and Colonial Response in the British Empire: A Framework for Analysis', in Benning (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth British Society of Sport Historians Conference*, (1986).
- Stoddart, B., 'The Hidden Influence of Sport', in Burgmann & Lee (ed.), *Constructing a Culture. A People's History of Australia since 1788*, (1988).
- Stoddart, B. & Sandiford, K.A.P., 'The Elite Schools and Cricket in Barbados: A Study in Colonial Continuity', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.3 (1987).
- Thompson, E.P., 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', reprinted in Giddens & Held, *Classes, Power, and Conflict*, (1988).
- Thompson, L.O'Brien, 'How Cricket is West Indian Cricket? Class, Racial and Color Conflict', *Caribbean Review*, Vol.XII, no.2 (1983).
- Tozer, M., 'From "Muscular Christianity" to "Esprit de Corps": Games in the Victorian Public Schools of England', *Stadion*, Vol.7, no.1 (1981).
- Tranter, N.L., 'Organised Sport and the Working Classes of Central Scotland, 1820-1900; The Neglected Sport of Quoiting', in Holt (ed.), *Sport and the Working Class*, (1990).
- Tranter, N.L., 'The Social and Occupational Structure of Organized Sport in Central Scotland during the Nineteenth Century', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.3 (1987).
- Vamplew, W., 'Not Playing the Game: Unionism in British Professional Sport, 1870-1914', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.2, no.3 (1985).
- Vamplew, W., 'Sport and Industrialisation: An Economic Interpretation of the Changes in Popular Sport in Nineteenth-Century England', in Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, (1988).
- Vamplew, W., 'Sports Crowds Disorder in Britain, 1870-1914: Causes and Controls' in *Journal of Sport History*, Vol.7, no.1 (1980).
- Veitch, C., '"Play Up! Play Up! And Win the War!": Football, the Nation and the First World War, 1914-1915', *Journal of Contemporary History*, no.20 (1985).
- Walvin, J., 'Sport, Social History and the Historian', *B.J.S.H.*, Vol.1, no.1 (1984).
- Ward, R., 'The Australian Legend Revisited', *Historical Studies*, Vol.18, (1978).
- Yeo, E. & S., 'Perceived Patterns: Competition and Licence Versus Class and Struggle', in Yeo, E. & S. (eds.), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914*, (1981).
- Yeo, E. & S., 'Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus Class and Struggle', in Yeo E. & S. (eds.), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914*, (1981).
- Young, D.C., 'The Origins of the Modern Olympics: A New Version', *I.J.H.S.*, Vol.4, no.2 (1987).

Theses and Dissertations

- Brookes, C.C.P., *Cricket as a Vocation: A Study of the Development and Contemporary Structure of the Occupation and Career Patterns of the Cricketer*, (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leicester 1974).
- Montefiore, D., *'Cricket in the Doldrums'. The Struggle between Private and Public Control of Australian Cricket in the 1880s.* (B.A.(Hons.) Thesis (unpub.), School of History, University of New South Wales 1989).
- Frost, W., *The 1861-62 All England Cricket Eleven's Visit to Melbourne, and its Effects on the Links between Victoria and England*, (B.A.Thesis (unpub.), Melbourne University 1986).